

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Agricultural
Cooperative
Service

ACS
Service Report
Number 16

Cooperative Education Needs

*Who should be educated?
Who should teach them?
What's the role of AIC?*



ABSTRACT

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION NEEDS by Charles A. Kraenzle, Director, Cooperative Management Division (CMD), Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS), U.S. Department of Agriculture; David W. Simpson, Vice President, Education Administration, American Institute of Cooperation (AIC); Roger A. Wissman, and Ralph M. Richardson, Agricultural Economist and Agricultural Statistician, respectively, CMD, ACS. ACS Service Report 16, July 1986.

An American Institute of Cooperation (AIC) survey of U.S. cooperatives regarding cooperative education needs found young farmers to be the highest priority target audience for respondents. The priority of target audiences was different for selected groups of cooperatives, by cooperative size, and by farm credit district. Differences also existed in which target audiences, local and regional cooperatives, State cooperative organizations, USDA's Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS), AIC, and Extension Service should be providing cooperative education. Promoting cooperatives was identified as one of the most important AIC activities. AIC's use of educational materials was considered the most effective method for educating a larger number of target audiences. A majority of respondents believed some changes were needed in AIC's programs and activities.

Key words: cooperatives, education, American Institute of Cooperation (AIC), Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS), State cooperative organizations, Extension Service.

ACS Service Report 16, July 1986.

PREFACE

This report is the result of the American Institute of Cooperation's (AIC) concern with individual educational needs of cooperatives in the United States. AIC, with a grant from MSI Insurance through the Mutual Service Fund of the Cooperative League, in cooperation with Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS), conducted a survey of all AIC members plus a stratified random sampling of nonmember cooperatives including rural telephone cooperatives, rural electric cooperatives, and farm marketing, supply, and related service cooperatives.

More than 84 percent of the respondents were marketing, farm supply, related service, and farm credit associations. Consequently, the overall findings of the study were significantly influenced by the needs of these groups.

Cooperatives ranked target audiences for cooperative education; indicated what group or groups should be providing educational services to these audiences; the importance AIC should place on specific activities; the method or methods AIC should use to be most effective; their general impressions about AIC; and their organizational and business characteristics.

The study was done to help cooperative leaders and educators better understand: (1) educational priorities within the American cooperative system; (2) what organizations (ACS, AIC, local and regional cooperatives, State cooperative organizations, Extension Service) should be providing programs; (3) types of educational programs and services needed and desired; and (4) AIC's role in meeting cooperative educational needs.

Appreciation is extended to the 635 cooperatives responding to the survey. Appreciation also is extended to Loraine Hill, Greer Ross, and Nellie Jones, all of ACS, and Karen Hockett, AIC, for their assistance. The authors also valued the assistance of two individuals of USDA's Statistical Reporting Service (SRS)--Douglas C. Bond, for design of the sampling plan for AIC nonmembers and Wade W. Adams, for development of data handling techniques.

CONTENTS

	Page
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Problem.....	1
Objective.....	2
FINDINGS.....	2
Target Audiences.....	2
All respondents.....	2
Selected groups.....	4
By cooperative size.....	5
By farm credit district.....	5
Who Should Provide Education.....	7
Regional and local cooperatives.....	7
State cooperative organizations.....	9
American Institute of Cooperation.....	12
Agricultural Cooperative Service.....	12
Extension Service.....	15
By cooperative size.....	17
By farm credit district.....	21
Important AIC Activities.....	29
Selected groups.....	29
By cooperative size.....	32
By farm credit district.....	32
Methods AIC Should Use in Educational Efforts.....	32
Conferences, workshops, and institutes.....	32
Educational materials.....	36
Educational consulting services.....	41
Inappropriate AIC activities.....	41
General Impressions About AIC.....	48
Selected groups.....	48
By cooperative size.....	48
By farm credit district.....	48
SUMMARY.....	53
Target Audiences.....	53
Who Should Provide Education.....	54
Regional and local cooperatives.....	54
State cooperative organizations.....	54
American Institute of Cooperation.....	54

	Page
Agricultural Cooperative Service.....	55
Extension Service.....	55
Important AIC Activities.....	56
Methods AIC Should Use in Educational Efforts.....	56
General Impressions About AIC.....	57
APPENDIX.....	58
Methodology.....	59
Cover Letter.....	61
Questionnaire.....	62

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The information generated from this survey provides a clearer understanding of the ways agricultural cooperatives viewed cooperative education. It also establishes a base on which to plan future cooperative education programs. And it helps determine where further research on cooperative education would be helpful. Efforts should be made on a national basis to identify current educational offerings and areas where needs still exist.

Responses to the survey, especially by AIC nonmembers, were much lower than expected. AIC member response also was lower than expected. Causes for the low responses were unclear. While some cooperatives may not be familiar with AIC, the survey indicated a lack of commitment to cooperative education.

Respondents identified young farmers, legislators, directors, members, employees, managers, prospective members, and media as high-priority target audiences.

Overall, the ranking of target audiences for cooperative education was as expected. Cooperative educators have earlier identified high-priority audiences in cooperative literature. The high ranking of legislators by all respondents is because of the concern of farm credit organizations and the large cooperatives.

Evidently they believed legislators needed more cooperative education than other target audiences including their members and/or employees. The need to have legislators understand their concerns could also reflect the difficult economic times many of these cooperatives were facing and the respondents' beliefs that legislators may be able to help in this regard.

More importantly, however, is that many decisions affecting farm credit cooperatives may be made or influenced by legislators and other external audiences. The impact of such a decision would be more immediate than for other target audiences. It seems, therefore, that cooperative educators create an important climate for cooperatives by providing legislators with a basic understanding and appreciation of cooperative businesses. Support for cooperative education activities will be enhanced to the extent that cooperative leaders perceive education activities to have had a positive impact in the legislative area.

In most cases, respondents believed all identified target audiences except for grade school educators and students should be given high- to medium-priority. General public and high school educators and students were identified as medium-priority by most.

However, rankings of these target audiences by selected groups, size, and location were quite different in many cases. These differences make it extremely difficult for an organization like AIC to develop general cooperative education programs and activities that meet the needs of all cooperatives. It suggests the establishment of specific programs tailored to meet the needs of homogeneous groups. The feasibility of this approach is yet to be determined. At a minimum, AIC should examine redirecting some resources currently expended on youth education to other activities, perhaps young farmer education.

Respondents did discriminate when asked to identify organizations that should be major providers of cooperative education to specific target audiences. Regional

and local cooperatives, State cooperative organizations, and AIC should be major providers of cooperative education to many of the target audiences. ACS and Extension Service should be major providers of cooperative education mainly to external audiences such as universities, legislators, county extension agents, and media and minor providers of education to the other target audiences.

Smaller cooperatives believed ACS should be a major provider of education to legislators and media; larger cooperatives did not agree. The perception of the latter may reflect a broader knowledge and understanding of ACS's mission as a Federal agency.

It seems particularly important that there was greater disagreement among respondents on the target audiences to be educated by AIC than those to be educated by other organizations. A consensus among cooperatives on the high-priority target audiences for cooperative education by AIC must be reached for planning and carrying out future programs.

The following recommendations must be considered as a result of these findings. One, AIC should clearly define its primary goals and publicize them within the membership. Two, the relationship between AIC, State cooperative councils, and ACS should be more clearly defined with respect to organizational responsibilities.

Some conflict or disagreement with regard to target audiences also exists. For example, State councils consider high school students a high-priority target audience. No other group identified them as high-priority. Yet, many cooperatives that consider high school students low-priority are probably members of State cooperative councils.

The State cooperative councils also saw themselves as being major providers of education to more target audiences than did other selected groups. They also put heavier emphasis on their role of educating legislators and gave other organizations much lower priority in educating legislators than did other groups.

The general public was considered a medium-priority target audience. Yet, many of the selected groups believed cooperatives, State organizations, and AIC should be major providers of cooperative education to this audience.

With regard to activities listed for AIC, 60 percent or so were considered very important and the remaining somewhat important. However, some significant differences existed in priority of these activities in comparing group responses. This was especially true for State cooperative councils, which put greater priority on AIC developing educational materials, being a central clearinghouse for educational and training materials, general communications, and the AIC yearbook. This was understood considering the activities and needs of the State cooperative councils.

AIC's programs do place importance on most activities given high-priority (2.34 or above) as noted in the AIC Long Range Plan. However, an activity receiving more attention by AIC than the study seemed to substantiate was youth education. Respondents ranked grade and high school students lower than other target audiences. A lower rating, however, doesn't necessarily mean the target audience was unimportant.

One activity where AIC expends a fairly large amount of resources is in development of an annual yearbook--American Cooperation. State cooperative councils and federated cooperatives were the only groups which identified it as very important. Development and distribution of educational materials by AIC were considered much

more important. An evaluation needs to be made of the yearbook if AIC is to continue this as a major part of its program.

Use of educational materials was the preferred educational method for AIC in most cases. Noting the strong preference, AIC should concentrate on its role as a developer, wholesaler, and distributor of materials to support the direct contact providers of cooperative education (cooperatives, State councils, and other groups).

Since ACS is currently the largest distributor of educational materials, a clear understanding of each organization's role should be developed. It should be noted that government decisions on user fees for publications may dramatically affect future organizational roles.

In the program area, AIC's current offerings would seem to meet the expressed needs adequately. Support for consulting services was quite low as a delivery method that seemed to contradict the respondents' desires for AIC to be a coordinator. Perhaps the respondents were not familiar with the use of the terminology as used on the questionnaire.

AIC, in planning programs, must keep in mind that a fairly large percent (15-27 percent) of certain groups believe educating and informing legislators, educating general public, and working with international cooperative organizations were considered inappropriate activities for AIC.

General impressions about AIC varied by selected groups, cooperative size, and farm credit district. Some respondents believed changes were needed in AIC's programs and activities. The important point is that a substantial percentage of the larger cooperatives--the ones who provide AIC most financial support--believed changes were necessary.

Cooperative leaders and educators should evaluate the findings of this study and identify who is providing cooperative education to what target audiences, develop a master plan for cooperative education on a national basis, and develop programs and activities that relate to the master plan that better meet the needs of different types and sizes of cooperatives in various locations. In this manner, limited resources of all groups involved in cooperative education can be used to maximize the benefits.

AIC must provide leadership in developing a master plan for cooperative education and be the catalyst to see that programs and activities of all organizations involved in cooperative education are directed toward meeting the educational needs of cooperatives in an efficient and effective manner.

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION NEEDS

Charles A. Kraenzle 1/
David W. Simpson 1/
Roger A. Wissman 1/
Ralph M. Richardson 1/

INTRODUCTION

Cooperatives are continuously faced with challenges to provide more basic education and training on the cooperative form of business. These challenges are brought about by changing membership, business growth resulting in more complex operations, variations in organizational structures, criticism from groups challenging public policies on cooperatives, and other political, social, and economic changes. 2/

The cooperative form of business is not the usual enterprise. A cooperative is owned and controlled by members. It has other unique characteristics and requires that members, potential members, suppliers, lenders, and others know what they are and how they differ from other businesses.

Cooperatives also are faced with educating legislators and the general public. Many decisions affecting cooperatives are often based on the knowledge government representatives and the general public have about cooperatives. Lack of knowledge about cooperatives could result in decisions that are detrimental to them.

Educating various groups of people about the cooperative form of business raises questions. Who should be educated and how? What priorities should be given to educating target audiences? What are the most effective methods for educating various audiences? And what kind and amount of resources should be devoted to cooperative education?

Some cooperatives find it difficult to allocate resources to cooperative education because the returns are difficult to measure. Many cooperatives would rather use their limited resources to provide services where they are ensured of a measurable rate of return.

Problem

In the mid-1920s, national farm leaders and educators saw the need for a continuing forum for discussing issues related to the development of the then emerging cooperative system. E. G. Nourse, a professor of cooperation at Iowa State College and later associated with what was to become the Brookings Institute, stressed the need for an independent body through which cooperative leaders could share experiences and learn from one another. The idea was put into action with the formal organization of the American Institute of Cooperation (AIC) in 1925.

1/ Charles A. Kraenzle, Ralph M. Richardson, and Roger A. Wissman are Director, Agricultural Statistician, and Agricultural Economist respectively, in the Cooperative Management Division, Agricultural Cooperative Service. David W. Simpson is Vice President, Education Administration, American Institute of Cooperation.

2/ Kirkman, C. H., Jr., Cooperative Education and Training, Cooperative Information Report 1, Section 10, USDA, ACS, Washington, D.C., March 1983, p. 2

The purpose of the American Institute of Cooperation was to collect and make available accurate information concerning the history and practical application of the principles of cooperation as business practices. For 60 years, AIC has served the purpose founders envisioned: an open forum for the discussion of cooperative problems. Programs oriented to various groups such as youth, young farm couples, vocational agriculture instructors, directors, and others have been tailored to meet needs perceived by the cooperative community.

In 1985, the American Institute of Cooperation (AIC) observed its 60th anniversary in cooperative education. Cooperatives changed considerably during those years. Many became larger while others went out of business, merged, consolidated, or were acquired by other businesses.

The larger size and changing structure of cooperatives raises questions about their educational needs. Should AIC continue with the same educational programs it has provided in the past? What kind of educational needs are not being met? What kind of education should be provided in the future and who should provide it?

Objective

The purpose of this study is to provide U.S. cooperatives and cooperative leaders with a clearer understanding of the educational needs of agricultural cooperatives. Specifically, the study was designed to provide guidance to AIC in designing educational programs and services that reflect the needs of specific clientele groups. Objectives of the study are to identify (1) target audiences for cooperative education, (2) who should be educating these audiences, and (3) the role of AIC in cooperative education. The methodology used for the study is described in the appendix.

FINDINGS

Findings were categorized for all respondents, type of cooperative, size of cooperative, and by farm credit district.

No comparison of member and nonmember responses was included in this report because of low response by nonmembers. Only 25 percent of respondents were not AIC members although they represented more than 51 percent of the total number surveyed.

Target Audiences

Seventeen groups were listed on the questionnaire as target audiences for cooperative education (table 1). Respondents were asked to rank each audience high with a 1, medium with a 2, or low with a 3 according to the priorities of their organization. Responses were weighted so an average rating could be obtained to rank target audiences. For example, a weighted average of 3 would mean all respondents identified the target audience as highest priority. A weighted average of 2.34 and above is considered high-priority; 2.33 to 1.67 medium-priority; and 1.66 or less low-priority.

All Respondents

All respondents rated young farmers as highest priority target audience. Their lack of experience and their importance to the future of cooperatives justified their place. Other high-priority audiences ranked in order were legislators, directors, members, employees, managers, prospective members, and media. All except two of the remaining target audiences--grade school educators and students--fell within medium-priority. These included county extension agents,

Table 1--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups																						
Target Audience	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops			Telephone and Electric co-ops		State Co-op Councils		Regional & inter-regionals co-ops		Mixed structure co-ops		Federated co-ops		Centralized co-ops		All marketing co-ops except grain						
	All co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	Credit co-ops	co-ops	Co-ops	Co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops					
Rank and weighted average for each group																						
Young farmers	1	2.78	1	2.83	2	2.78	7	2.49	3	2.75	3	2.73	6	2.65	7	2.55	1	2.80	1	2.91	1	2.74
Legislators	2	2.70	6	*2.62	1	*2.83	3	2.68	8	2.36	4	2.70	3	2.77	5	2.57	2	2.71	6	2.62	3	2.69
Directors	3	2.70	2	*2.79	6	*2.58	4	2.68	1	2.84	2	2.75	2	2.88	1	2.78	3	2.68	2	2.85	4	2.66
Members	4	2.68	3	*2.74	5	*2.60	2	2.83	5	2.50	1	2.76	4	2.77	2	2.73	4	2.67	4	2.76	2	2.72
Employees	5	2.63	5	*2.72	7	*2.49	1	2.83	6	2.42	6	2.65	1	2.88	3	2.69	5	2.61	3	2.79	6	2.57
Managers	6	2.57	4	*2.72	9	*2.38	6	2.54	2	2.76	5	2.65	5	2.73	4	2.63	6	2.56	5	2.75	5	2.64
Prospective members	7	2.53	7	2.57	3	2.61	11	2.16	12	2.17	7	2.56	7	2.38	6	2.56	7	2.54	7	2.61	7	2.53
Media	8	2.51	8	*2.42	4	*2.61	5	2.59	9	2.33	8	2.48	7	2.50	8	2.41	8	2.52	8	2.45	8	2.48
County extension agents	9	2.30	10	*2.26	8	*2.39	12	2.12	11	2.21	10	2.20	10	2.04	12	2.06	9	2.33	10	2.26	9	2.37
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	10	2.24	9	2.30	10	2.25	15	1.93	10	2.25	9	2.31	9	2.19	9	2.37	10	2.23	9	2.29	10	2.29
High school educators	11	2.15	11	2.16	12	2.07	8	2.41	7	2.42	12	2.03	13	1.96	11	2.06	11	2.17	11	2.15	11	2.14
General public	12	2.11	12	2.11	11	2.09	9	2.31	15	1.83	15	1.88	11	2.00	15	1.78	12	2.14	12	2.08	12	2.03
High school students	13	2.07	13	2.07	13	1.98	10	2.27	4	2.58	14	1.92	12	2.00	14	1.94	13	2.09	13	2.06	13	2.03
Postsecondary educators	14	1.93	14	1.92	14	1.94	16	1.86	13	2.04	11	2.04	14	1.92	10	2.08	14	1.91	14	1.90	14	1.98
Postsecondary students	15	1.88	15	1.88	15	1.89	17	1.81	14	1.96	13	1.98	15	1.85	13	2.02	15	1.87	15	1.85	15	1.97
Grade school educators	16	1.47	16	*1.49	16	*1.32	13	2.08	17	1.38	16	1.48	17	1.40	16	1.43	16	1.48	16	1.51	16	1.48
Grade school students	17	1.41	17	*1.44	17	*1.24	14	1.95	16	1.42	17	1.39	16	1.40	17	1.31	17	1.41	17	1.45	17	1.45

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

university extension and research personnel, high school educators, the general public, high school students, and postsecondary educators and students.

Selected Groups

For analysis, respondents were grouped by type, structure, and function. Ten groups were selected. These included (1) marketing, supply, and related service (MSRS); (2) credit; (3) rural telephone and electric (electric); (4) State councils; (5) regional and interregional; (6) mixed structure; (7) federated; (8) centralized; (9) grain marketing; and (10) marketing excluding grain marketing cooperatives (MEGM). The 10 groups are not mutually exclusive. ^{3/}

MSRS cooperatives ranked young farmers as highest priority, followed by directors, members, managers, employees, and legislators.

Credit cooperatives ranked legislators, young farmers, and prospective members as highest priority target audiences for cooperative education. Statistically, credit cooperatives gave higher priority to legislators, media, and county extension agents and lower priority to members, directors, employees, managers, and grade school educators and students than did MSRS cooperatives.

Electric cooperatives gave highest priority to employees, members, and legislators. Young farmers were ranked seventh with a weighted average of 2.49. Prospective members, county extension agents, and university extension and research personnel were ranked lower than other groups ranked them. However, electric cooperatives gave higher priority to grade school educators and students.

Electric cooperatives serve all residents in their market area. Their customer base is established and they concentrate on serving their members. Young farmers in their service areas are members using their services. Consequently, it was not expected that young farmers and prospective members would be highest priority target audiences.

State cooperative councils gave directors highest priority for cooperative education. Managers, young farmers, and high school students were next in order of priority. The high-priority given to high school students and educators was significant when compared with priority given these audiences by other groups.

Regional and interregional cooperatives gave highest priority to educating members, directors, young farmers, legislators, managers, and employees. No other group ranked members highest.

Cooperatives with different organizational structures gave somewhat different priorities to target audiences. Centralized cooperatives, totaling 560 or 88 percent of the respondents, as expected, ranked target audiences the same as all respondents. Mixed structure and federated cooperatives totaled 26 (4 percent) and 49 (8 percent), respectively.

In comparison, mixed structure cooperatives put higher priority on educating employees and directors than federated or centralized cooperatives. Centralized cooperatives gave young farmers and legislators highest priority. This was due to the large number of credit cooperatives included (table 1).

^{3/} Groups (1) and (2) included more than 84 percent of the respondents. To determine if rankings of target audiences by these two groups were significantly different, t-tests were used.

The ranking of target audiences by grain marketing cooperatives was similar to the ranking by MSRS cooperatives. Grain marketing cooperatives totaled 131 or 44.6 percent of all MSRS cooperatives and 58 percent of marketing cooperatives. In comparing grain marketing cooperatives with all other types of marketing cooperatives, few real differences in priorities for educating target audiences were noted. Both ranked young farmers as highest priority and included directors, legislators, members, employees, and managers in the six highest priority target audiences.

By Cooperative Size

Priority of target audiences for cooperative education was analyzed by comparing responses of six different size categories. The size categories and number of respondents in each were as follows:

<u>Cooperative Size</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Less than \$10 million	212
\$10 to \$24.9 million	119
\$25 to \$74.9 million	117
\$75 to \$249.9 million	98
\$250 to \$999.9 million	44
\$1 billion or more	22
Total	612

Twenty-three cooperatives reported no sales or income and were not included.

Cooperatives with sales of less than \$250 million targeted young farmers highest priority for cooperative education. Cooperatives with sales of \$250 to \$999.9 million ranked members highest priority for cooperative education and young farmers second. The largest cooperatives, with sales of \$1 billion or more, ranked legislators highest priority. The weighted average of 2.91 for legislators was significantly higher than the weighted average for legislators of smaller sales groups that ranged from 2.67 to 2.74 (table 2).

Young farmers, legislators, directors, and members were included in the top four target audiences for cooperatives with sales of \$25 million or more. Cooperatives with sales less than \$25 million included employees in the top four target audiences. In each sales category, grade school educators and students were given low priority as target audiences for cooperative education.

Overall, there were few differences in priority of target audiences by sales class.

By Farm Credit District

In order to evaluate if location of cooperatives made some difference in priority of target audiences for cooperative education, responses were grouped by farm credit district for comparison. The farm credit district and the number of responses were as follows:

<u>Farm Credit District</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Springfield.....	29
Baltimore.....	37
Columbia.....	37
Louisville.....	118
Jackson.....	22

Table 2--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education, by cooperative size

Target Audience	Size grouping						
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.0 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more	
Rank and weighted average for each group							
Young farmers	1 2.75	1 2.80	1 2.86	1 2.76	2 2.74	4 2.82	
Legislators	2 2.67	5 2.71	3 2.74	2 2.73	3 2.70	1 2.91	
Directors	3 2.67	2 2.78	4 2.69	3 2.65	4 2.63	2 2.86	
Members	5 2.61	4 2.76	2 2.77	4 2.62	1 2.77	3 2.82	
Employees	4 2.64	3 2.77	6 2.61	6 2.53	8 2.47	5 2.76	
Managers	6 2.56	6 2.64	8 2.52	8 2.50	5 2.60	7 2.64	
Prospective members	8 2.46	7 2.56	5 2.67	5 2.61	6 2.56	8 2.55	
Media	7 2.51	8 2.52	7 2.54	7 2.51	9 2.44	6 2.68	
County extension agents	9 2.33	9 2.34	9 2.33	9 2.26	10 2.21	10 2.29	
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	10 2.24	10 2.30	10 2.20	10 2.13	7 2.49	9 2.36	
High school educators	11 2.21	11 2.18	11 2.16	12 2.04	13 2.05	11 2.10	
General public	12 2.19	12 2.17	12 2.13	11 2.10	15 1.79	15 1.86	
High school students	13 2.05	13 2.16	13 2.09	13 2.00	14 1.93	14 1.91	
Postsecondary educators	14 1.83	14 1.91	14 2.02	14 1.91	11 2.19	12 2.05	
Postsecondary students	15 1.79	15 1.88	15 1.96	15 1.88	12 2.07	13 2.00	
Grade school educators	16 1.49	16 1.55	16 1.42	16 1.35	16 1.51	16 1.43	
Grade school students	17 1.43	17 1.53	17 1.32	17 1.32	17 1.37	17 1.38	

St. Louis.....	112
St. Paul.....	80
Omaha.....	80
Wichita.....	41
Texas.....	22
Sacramento.....	22
Spokane.....	35
Total.....	635

The largest number of responses were from the Louisville and St. Louis districts. Other districts, however, had at least 22 or more respondents which provided some credibility in comparison of results.

Respondents in 8 of 12 farm credit districts ranked young farmers as the highest priority for cooperative education. However, directors were first in the Baltimore district. Texas and Spokane districts ranked managers highest priority. Prospective members were Sacramento's number one target audience (table 3).

Young farmers, directors, legislators, members, employees, and managers were all considered high-priority (2.34 and above) in each of the districts. Prospective members and media also would fall into this group if Wichita and Springfield districts were excluded. County extension agents were given high-priority in Springfield, Columbia, Louisville, Jackson, and St. Louis districts.

Cooperatives in the Texas district put university extension and research personnel at the top. High school educators were high-priority in the St. Paul district. Omaha district gave high-priority to the general public. The remaining target audiences except for grade school educators and students were given medium-priority in each district. All districts gave low-priority to grade school educators and students.

Who Should Provide Education

Respondents indicated to what extent cooperatives (regional and local), State cooperative organizations, AIC, USDA's Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS), and Extension Service should be providing educational services to target audiences previously discussed. For each target audience, respondents identified which organizations should be major providers, minor providers, or have little or no involvement.

Weighted averages were used to identify which organizations respondents believed should be providing education to target audiences. A weighted average of 2.34 and above indicated respondents identified the particular association or organization as the major provider of education to the target audience in question. A rating of 2.33 to 1.67 identified an organization as a minor provider. A rating of 1.66 or less indicated the organization should have little or no involvement.

Regional and Local Cooperatives

Respondents believed cooperatives should be a major provider of education to (1) members, (2) directors, (3) young farmers, (4) employees, (5) prospective members, (6) managers, (7) media, (8) legislators, and (9) the general public. They should be minor providers of education to the remaining target audiences. The significance of the response is that cooperatives should be involved in educating all target audiences to some degree.

Table 3--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education, by farm credit district

Target Audience	Farm credit district											
	Springfield	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane
	Rank and weighted average for each district											
Young farmers	1 2.93	4 2.65	1 2.89	1 2.76	1 2.73	1 2.75	1 2.84	1 2.81	1 2.73	4 2.86	8 2.50	2 2.82
Directors	2 2.75	1 2.86	3 2.78	3 2.69	2 2.59	3 2.69	4 2.63	4 2.69	4 2.63	2 2.86	5 2.50	3 2.79
Legislators	3 2.72	6 2.49	2 2.81	2 2.74	3 2.59	2 2.69	2 2.75	2 2.76	5 2.56	6 2.67	2 2.68	5 2.71
Members	4 2.64	3 2.68	4 2.76	5 2.65	7 2.45	4 2.66	3 2.67	3 2.76	2 2.70	5 2.81	4 2.59	4 2.79
Prospective members	5 2.50	8 2.40	6 2.68	7 2.56	4 2.55	8 2.52	8 2.48	6 2.58	8 2.30	7 2.62	1 2.73	7 2.61
Employees	6 2.46	2 2.68	5 2.72	4 2.69	5 2.50	5 2.59	7 2.51	5 2.68	3 2.65	3 2.86	6 2.50	6 2.61
County extension agents	7 2.43	9 2.32	8 2.50	9 2.36	9 2.36	9 2.35	11 2.27	12 2.10	9 2.25	10 2.29	9 2.32	11 2.12
Managers	8 2.39	5 2.59	7 2.62	8 2.53	8 2.41	6 2.54	6 2.55	7 2.56	6 2.56	1 2.90	7 2.50	1 2.88
Media	9 2.28	7 2.46	9 2.50	6 2.57	6 2.45	7 2.54	5 2.58	8 2.50	7 2.45	9 2.38	3 2.64	8 2.44
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	10 2.14	11 2.19	10 2.39	11 2.18	10 2.32	10 2.26	10 2.30	10 2.27	10 2.10	8 2.43	10 2.32	10 2.15
Postsecondary educators	11 2.07	14 1.89	12 2.06	14 1.77	14 1.86	14 1.87	14 2.09	14 1.99	14 1.93	14 2.05	12 2.09	14 1.76
High school educators	12 2.04	10 2.22	11 2.11	10 2.22	11 2.05	11 2.14	9 2.35	11 2.19	11 2.05	13 2.05	14 1.82	13 1.97
High school students	13 2.00	12 2.08	14 2.03	12 2.13	12 2.05	13 2.02	12 2.23	13 2.10	13 2.00	12 2.10	15 1.73	12 2.03
Postsecondary students	14 2.00	15 1.78	15 1.97	15 1.76	15 1.86	15 1.79	15 2.04	15 1.96	15 1.85	15 2.00	13 2.09	15 1.73
General public	15 1.93	13 2.03	13 2.03	13 2.07	13 1.95	12 2.07	13 2.16	9 2.34	12 2.00	11 2.10	11 2.14	9 2.26
Grade school educators	16 1.43	16 1.62	16 1.47	16 1.40	16 1.55	16 1.45	16 1.55	16 1.56	16 1.58	16 1.29	16 1.32	17 1.30
Grade school students	17 1.29	17 1.38	17 1.39	17 1.35	17 1.55	17 1.37	17 1.51	17 1.50	17 1.53	17 1.29	17 1.27	16 1.33

Table 4 shows the extent to which local and regional cooperatives should be educating target audiences as indicated by all respondents and selected groups of respondents. All groups identified members as highest or relatively high-priority for education by cooperatives. Electric cooperatives and State councils gave highest priority to employees. The regional and interregional cooperatives gave directors highest priority although the weighted average was very close to the weighted average given to members. Grain marketing cooperatives gave highest priority to cooperatives being the major provider of education to young farmers.

All 10 selected groups identified cooperatives as major providers of education to members, directors, young farmers, employees, prospective members, managers, media, and legislators. The general public also was included in this grouping if regional and interregional cooperatives, federated cooperatives, and grain marketing cooperatives were excluded. Credit, electric, and mixed structure cooperatives also thought cooperatives should be major providers of education to county extension agents.

Selected groups' responses were similar regarding the educational role of local and regional cooperatives. The six target audiences ranked highest in most cases were directly related to cooperatives' day-to-day operations or with potential members.

Legislators as a target audience ranked second, but as a educational priority for cooperatives, it ranked 8 out of 17. This indicates cooperatives may rely on other organizations for educating legislators.

In almost all cases, cooperatives were identified as minor providers of education to high school educators and students, university research and extension personnel, postsecondary educators and students, and grade school educators and students. Only three groups--regional and interregional cooperatives, federated cooperatives, and MEGM cooperatives--believed cooperatives should have little or no involvement in educating grade school students. The latter group also included grade school educators in this category.

State Cooperative Organizations

State cooperative organizations should be major providers of education to legislators, media, managers, young farmers, directors, members, university extension and research personnel, general public, county extension agents, employees, and prospective members. They should be minor providers of education to the remaining target audiences according to respondents (table 5).

All but three selected groups had legislators as the most important target audience. Electric cooperatives gave higher weighted averages to managers, media, and directors than they did to legislators. And State cooperative councils and mixed structure cooperatives ranked young farmers above legislators.

State cooperative councils saw the State cooperative organizations as major providers of education to all target audiences except for prospective members and grade school educators and students. Here, they identified them as minor providers. They also gave more weight to the State cooperative organizations educating managers, directors, university extension and research personnel, employees, and high school students and educators than most other selected groups did. However, they gave less weight to educating members and prospective members than other selected groups.

Electric cooperatives indicated State cooperative organizations should place more emphasis on employees and the general public. Mixed structure cooperatives thought

Table 4--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by regional and local cooperatives, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups																						
Target Audience	All co-ops	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops			Telephone and Electric co-ops		State Co-op Councils		Regional & inter-regional co-ops		Mixed structure co-ops		Federated co-ops		Centralized co-ops		Grain marketing co-ops		All marketing co-ops except grain			
Rank and weighted average for each group																						
Members	1	2.85	2	2.87	1	2.82	3	2.85	4	2.92	2	2.93	1	3.00	2	2.89	1	2.84	2	2.87	1	2.85
Directors	2	2.82	1	2.87	4	2.75	2	2.85	5	2.83	1	2.94	5	2.92	1	2.94	2	2.80	4	2.86	2	2.84
Young farmers	3	2.80	4	2.85	3	2.76	5	2.70	3	2.92	6	2.80	6	2.88	5	2.77	3	2.80	1	2.89	3	2.82
Employees	4	2.80	3	2.86	5	2.70	1	2.87	1	2.96	3	2.89	2	2.96	3	2.85	4	2.79	3	2.87	5	2.78
Prospective members	5	2.75	6	2.77	2	2.78	8	2.54	6	2.79	4	2.89	3	2.92	6	2.74	5	2.75	6	2.77	4	2.79
Managers	6	2.70	5	2.77	6	2.59	6	2.67	2	2.96	5	2.83	4	2.92	4	2.81	6	2.67	5	2.80	6	2.67
Media	7	2.53	7	2.45	7	2.57	4	2.74	8	2.65	8	2.55	7	2.69	8	2.51	7	2.53	7	2.44	8	2.46
Legislators	8	2.49	8	2.41	8	2.56	9	2.49	7	2.65	7	2.60	8	2.64	7	2.55	8	2.48	8	2.39	7	2.51
General public	9	2.37	9	2.34	10	2.35	7	2.61	9	2.41	11	2.25	9	2.50	11	2.21	9	2.37	9	2.30	11	2.25
County extension agents	10	2.32	10	2.25	9	2.40	12	2.42	11	2.22	10	2.26	10	2.35	10	2.27	10	2.32	10	2.26	9	2.26
High school educators	11	2.19	12	2.12	11	2.20	10	2.46	10	2.23	12	2.05	14	2.16	12	2.11	11	2.19	12	2.15	13	1.99
High school students	12	2.17	11	2.15	12	2.15	11	2.42	13	2.18	14	1.97	15	2.12	13	1.98	12	2.19	11	2.17	12	2.00
Univ. ext. & pes. personnel	13	2.09	13	2.09	13	2.08	16	2.06	12	2.18	9	2.28	11	2.35	9	2.30	13	2.05	13	1.99	10	2.25
Postsecondary educators	14	1.90	14	1.82	14	1.95	15	2.08	14	2.14	13	2.01	12	2.32	14	1.94	14	1.88	14	1.75	14	1.87
Postsecondary students	15	1.87	15	1.80	15	1.90	17	2.02	15	2.05	15	1.92	13	2.24	16	1.81	15	1.86	16	1.72	15	1.85
Grade school educators	16	1.77	16	1.72	16	1.74	14	2.19	16	1.82	16	1.71	16	1.84	15	1.85	16	1.76	17	1.71	16	1.62
Grade school students	17	1.74	17	1.71	17	1.68	13	2.19	17	1.77	17	1.63	17	1.73	17	1.66	17	1.75	15	1.73	17	1.60

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

Table 5--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by State cooperative organizations, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups																						
Target Audience	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops				Telephone and Electric co-ops		State Co-op Councils		Regional & inter-regional co-ops		Mixed structure co-ops		Federated co-ops		Centralized co-ops		Grain marketing co-ops		All marketing co-ops except grain			
	All co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	co-ops		
Rank and weighted average for each group																						
Legislators Media Managers Young farmers Directors Members Univ. ext. & res. personnel General public County extension agents Employees Prospective members High school educators Postsecondary educators High school students Postsecondary students Grade school educators Grade school students	1	2.79	1	2.79	1	2.79	4	2.77	2	2.87	1	2.83	4	2.68	1	2.89	1	2.79	1	2.78	1	2.78
	2	2.71	5	2.67	2	2.71	2	2.83	4	2.79	3	2.68	8	2.52	5	2.68	2	2.72	5	2.66	3	2.67
	3	2.69	3	2.70	3	2.62	1	2.83	3	2.86	4	2.66	5	2.64	2	2.74	3	2.68	2	2.75	6	2.54
	4	2.66	2	2.71	4	2.59	7	2.53	1	2.88	2	2.70	1	2.80	4	2.72	4	2.64	3	2.71	2	2.68
	5	2.62	4	2.68	5	2.51	3	2.80	5	2.79	5	2.61	2	2.74	3	2.73	5	2.61	4	2.71	7	2.53
	6	2.51	6	2.54	6	2.49	8	2.53	13	2.39	7	2.54	6	2.64	6	2.61	7	2.50	6	2.49	9	2.44
	7	2.50	7	2.53	7	2.49	10	2.33	6	2.74	6	2.56	7	2.56	8	2.49	6	2.50	8	2.47	4	2.63
	8	2.45	8	2.50	9	2.37	6	2.58	11	2.46	10	2.44	3	2.72	9	2.47	8	2.44	7	2.48	8	2.48
	9	2.43	9	2.43	8	2.42	9	2.40	10	2.48	8	2.48	10	2.50	7	2.50	9	2.42	10	2.36	5	2.59
	11	2.36	13	2.29	10	2.37	5	2.59	8	2.50	13	2.27	14	2.30	10	2.42	10	2.35	11	2.29	14	2.20
	10	2.36	10	2.43	11	2.36	13	2.05	15	2.26	9	2.46	9	2.52	12	2.38	11	2.35	9	2.46	12	2.30
	12	2.27	11	2.36	13	2.17	12	2.20	9	2.48	12	2.32	13	2.33	13	2.36	12	2.26	12	2.29	10	2.43
	13	2.23	14	2.24	12	2.23	14	2.04	12	2.46	11	2.34	11	2.43	11	2.38	14	2.20	14	2.16	13	2.28
	14	2.21	12	2.30	15	2.07	11	2.24	7	2.57	15	2.17	12	2.33	14	2.21	13	2.20	13	2.23	11	2.37
	15	2.13	15	2.11	14	2.16	16	2.02	14	2.38	14	2.18	15	2.26	15	2.17	15	2.12	15	2.07	15	2.17
	16	1.91	16	2.04	16	1.71	15	2.02	16	2.13	16	2.04	16	2.04	16	2.06	16	1.89	16	1.95	16	2.01
	17	1.79	17	1.93	17	1.59	17	1.96	17	1.96	17	1.85	17	1.92	17	1.81	17	1.78	17	1.84	17	1.94

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

State cooperative organizations should put fairly high-priority on educating the general public. The general public was ranked third compared with lower ranking by other groups.

American Institute of Cooperation

Respondents identified AIC as a major provider of education for (1) media, (2) legislators, (3) university extension and research personnel, (4) managers, (5) young farmers, and (6) the general public. AIC should be a minor provider of education to the remaining target audiences (table 6).

Credit cooperatives thought AIC should be a major provider of education to legislators, media, university extension and research personnel, managers, and young farmers. They gave lower weights to AIC educating managers, young farmers, the general public, directors, high school educators, and grade school educators and students than did MSRS cooperatives. Higher weights were given high school students and employees.

Electric cooperatives believed AIC should give more emphasis to educating county extension agents and high school educators and less emphasis on educating legislators than did MSRS and credit cooperatives. The State cooperative councils gave university extension and research personnel highest priority and legislators lowest priority for cooperative education by AIC. They also believed AIC should be a major provider of education to postsecondary educators (ranked no. 2), postsecondary students, and high school educators.

Mixed structure cooperatives ranked general public number one target audience for AIC. They also put more weight on AIC educating postsecondary educators and members and less weight on educating media and legislators. Although legislators were given an average weight of 2.08, they ranked second to last as a target audience for AIC. Federated cooperatives ranked university extension and research personnel, managers, media, postsecondary educators, legislators, and young farmers as the top six target audiences. No major differences were noted in the priority of target audiences identified by other selected groups.

All cooperatives as a group ranked legislators as the second highest priority for AIC. The State cooperative councils gave legislators lowest priority for AIC, a much different evaluation. The State cooperative councils are specialized groups. They provide legislative and educational support to cooperatives within their States. They saw their role as working with and educating legislators. This may have accounted for their different view of AIC's role in educating legislators about cooperatives.

Agricultural Cooperative Service

ACS, according to all respondents, should be a major provider of education to (1) university extension and research personnel, (2) media, and (3) legislators. ACS should be a minor provider of education to the remaining target audiences except for grade school educators and students. Here respondents identified ACS as having little or no involvement (table 7). MSRS cooperative response was similar to the response of all respondents. However, MSRS cooperatives believed ACS should be a major provider of education to county extension agents and a minor provider of education to grade school students and employees.

Although credit cooperatives gave less weight to many of the target audiences than did MSRS cooperatives, they ranked legislators as first priority for ACS. Credit

Table 6--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by American Institute of Cooperation, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups																																
Target Audience	All co-ops	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops			Telephone and Electric co-ops			State Co-op Councils			Regional & inter-regional co-ops			Mixed structure co-ops			Federated co-ops			Centralized co-ops			Grain marketing co-ops			All marketing except grain						
		Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average	Rank	Weighted	Average				
Rank and weighted average for each group																																
Media Legislators Univ. ext. & res. personnel Managers Young farmers General public Directors Postsecondary educators County extension agents High school students High school educators Postsecondary students Members Employees Prospective members Grade school educators Grade school students	1	2.65	2	2.65	2	2.65	1	2.76	4	2.57	2	2.58	8	2.44	3	2.53	2	2.68	2	2.66	4	2.52										
	2	2.64	1	2.70	1	2.68	6	2.43	17	1.82	4	2.54	16	2.08	5	2.45	1	2.68	1	2.76	3	2.56										
	3	2.60	3	2.63	3	2.54	2	2.67	1	2.78	1	2.59	4	2.50	1	2.55	3	2.61	3	2.60	1	2.62										
	4	2.51	5	2.55	4	2.45	3	2.64	3	2.57	5	2.53	6	2.48	2	2.53	4	2.51	4	2.57	6	2.42										
	5	2.50	4	2.60	5	2.40	7	2.40	5	2.50	3	2.55	2	2.56	6	2.45	5	2.50	5	2.56	2	2.56										
	6	2.34	6	2.41	8	2.25	8	2.36	8	2.39	9	2.29	1	2.58	11	2.21	6	2.34	6	2.50	8	2.28										
	7	2.33	7	2.38	6	2.28	10	2.28	11	2.30	7	2.44	7	2.45	8	2.31	7	2.33	7	2.36	5	2.44										
	8	2.32	8	2.33	7	2.27	9	2.29	2	2.65	6	2.48	3	2.50	4	2.53	8	2.29	8	2.25	7	2.33										
	9	2.24	10	2.23	9	2.20	4	2.55	14	2.13	12	2.22	11	2.32	9	2.29	9	2.23	9	2.24	12	2.22										
	13	2.11	12	2.20	15	2.19	13	2.26	10	2.30	13	2.13	12	2.32	13	2.11	13	2.10	11	2.15	10	2.27										
	10	2.19	9	2.24	13	2.07	5	2.45	7	2.41	11	2.25	9	2.38	7	2.32	11	2.17	10	2.20	9	2.28										
	11	2.19	13	2.20	10	2.14	14	2.21	6	2.48	10	2.26	10	2.33	12	2.17	10	2.18	13	2.14	11	2.25										
	12	2.18	11	2.22	11	2.12	12	2.26	12	2.13	8	2.31	5	2.48	10	2.21	12	2.16	12	2.15	13	2.21										
	14	2.02	16	2.09	12	2.12	16	2.10	9	2.32	14	2.11	13	2.21	13	2.06	15	2.00	16	1.82	14	2.01										
	15	2.00	14	2.03	14	2.00	17	1.90	16	1.96	15	2.06	17	2.04	16	1.93	14	2.01	14	2.04	15	2.00										
	16	1.89	15	2.00	16	2.00	11	2.28	13	2.13	16	2.03	14	2.17	15	2.02	16	1.87	15	1.95	16	1.94										
	17	1.78	17	2.05	17	2.05	15	2.17	15	2.00	17	1.91	15	2.16	17	1.72	17	1.77	17	1.79	17	1.88										

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

Table 7--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by Agricultural Cooperative Service, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups																						
Target Audience	All co-ops	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops			Telephone and Electric co-ops			State Co-op Councils		Regional & inter-regional co-ops		Mixed structure co-ops	Federated co-ops	Centralized co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	All market-ing co-ops except grain						
		co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	Credit co-ops	Electric co-ops	Co-ops	Councils	co-ops	co-ops												
Rank and weighted average for each group																						
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	1	2.44	1	2.46	2	2.38	3	2.46	1	2.79	1	2.43	1	2.26	1	2.52	1	2.44	2	2.48	1	2.54
Media	3	2.39	3	2.40	3	2.34	2	2.56	4	2.39	4	2.30	4	2.13	4	2.33	3	2.40	3	2.41	4	2.37
Legislators	2	2.39	2	2.46	1	2.38	6	2.31	14	1.83	3	2.34	6	1.96	6	2.30	2	2.42	1	2.48	3	2.39
County extension agents	4	2.29	4	2.34	4	2.16	1	2.58	5	2.38	2	2.36	2	2.26	2	2.40	4	2.28	4	2.37	2	2.42
Young farmers	5	2.21	5	2.26	5	2.14	5	2.40	8	2.09	5	2.18	5	2.00	7	2.09	5	2.24	7	2.21	5	2.29
Managers	6	2.20	6	2.21	6	2.13	4	2.41	2	2.50	7	2.11	7	1.96	3	2.35	6	2.20	5	2.23	6	2.24
General public	7	2.10	7	2.15	7	2.15	7	2.28	6	2.22	8	2.03	3	2.17	8	2.04	7	2.10	6	2.22	7	2.15
Postsecondary educators	8	2.03	8	2.07	8	1.97	11	2.00	3	2.39	6	2.12	12	1.78	5	2.31	8	2.02	8	2.01	8	2.10
Members	9	1.97	9	1.98	9	1.93	8	2.18	12	1.87	9	2.02	11	1.78	9	2.02	9	1.97	9	1.95	10	2.04
Directors	11	1.92	10	1.96	13	1.85	10	2.05	9	2.09	11	1.96	8	1.95	11	2.00	11	1.92	10	1.94	9	2.07
Postsecondary students	10	1.92	11	1.92	10	1.90	13	1.95	7	2.13	10	1.98	13	1.74	10	2.00	10	1.93	11	1.90	12	1.95
High school educators	12	1.91	12	1.91	11	1.87	9	2.08	10	2.00	12	1.90	9	1.83	12	2.00	12	1.91	12	1.87	11	1.99
Prospective members	13	1.84	14	1.82	12	1.86	14	1.92	15	1.78	13	1.89	15	1.61	13	1.82	13	1.86	14	1.78	14	1.85
High school students	14	1.81	13	1.83	15	1.74	12	2.00	13	1.86	14	1.74	14	1.64	15	1.78	14	1.82	2	1.79	13	1.85
Employees	15	1.68	17	1.56	14	1.75	15	1.85	11	1.91	16	1.73	10	1.82	16	1.70	15	1.67	17	1.50	15	1.73
Grade school educators	16	1.66	15	1.71	16	1.56	16	1.83	16	1.77	15	1.73	16	1.61	14	1.80	16	1.65	15	1.67	16	1.67
Grade school students	17	1.56	16	1.60	17	1.46	17	1.80	17	1.64	17	1.61	17	1.57	17	1.67	17	1.55	16	1.55	17	1.59

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

cooperatives also thought ACS should have little or no involvement in educating grade school educators and students.

Electric cooperatives identified county extension agents as number one priority for ACS. They also believed ACS should be a major provider of education to managers and young farmers. Only two other groups--State councils and federated cooperatives--identified managers as a high-priority target audience for ACS. Electric cooperatives also put more weight on ACS educating members and high school educators. They believed ACS should be a minor provider of education to grade school educators and students.

State cooperative councils put higher weights on ACS educating university extension and research personnel, managers, and postsecondary students. Much lower priority (ranked 14) was given to ACS educating legislators.

Mixed structure cooperatives did not identify audiences where ACS should be a major provider of education. ACS should be a minor provider of education to all audiences except for high school students, prospective members, and grade school educators and students. This group gave lower priority to legislators than did other selected groups except for credit cooperatives.

The ranking and weighted averages for centralized cooperatives were similar to the ranking and weighted averages of all respondents.

Few differences were noted for grain marketing cooperatives and MEGM cooperatives.

Extension Service

Respondents believed the Extension Service should be a major provider of education to county extension agents, university extension and research personnel, and young farmers. They should be a minor provider of education to remaining target audiences except for employees. Here, respondents thought they should have little or no involvement (table 8).

The ranking of target audiences by MSRS cooperatives for cooperative education by Extension Service appeared to be fairly similar to the response of all cooperatives. Credit cooperatives' response was also fairly similar except they gave lower weight to educating county extension agents, university extension and research personnel, legislators, grade school educators and students, and directors than did MSRS cooperatives. Credit cooperatives, however, gave a higher weight to educating employees than did MSRS cooperatives.

Electric cooperatives believed Extension Service should be a major provider of education to a larger number of target audiences. Besides county extension agents, university extension and research personnel, and young farmers, they included media, members, high school students, general public, and high school educators. They also gave higher weights to providing education to grade school educators and managers than other selected groups.

State cooperative councils gave lower priority to the Extension Service educating high school and grade school students and legislators than other groups. In fact, legislators and grade school students were two audiences where State cooperative councils believed the Extension Service should have little or no involvement in cooperative education.

Mixed structure and marketing cooperatives also identified the Extension Service as a major provider of education to the general public. Marketing cooperatives also

Table 8--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by Extension Service, by all respondents and selected groups

Target Audience	All cooperatives and selected groups										All market-			
	All co-ops	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops	Credit co-ops	Telephone and Electric co-ops	State Co-op Councils	Regional & inter-regional co-ops	Mixed structure co-ops	Federated co-ops	Centralized co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	except grain	ing co-ops	except grain
Rank and weighted average for each group														
County extension agents	1 2.68	1 *2.72	1 *2.59	1 2.80	1 2.74	1 2.81	2 2.67	1 2.77	1 2.67	1 2.73	1 2.73	1 2.78	1 2.78	1 2.78
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	2 2.50	2 *2.57	3 *2.37	2 2.70	2 2.57	2 2.68	1 2.70	2 2.65	3 2.47	2 2.54	2 2.54	2 2.71	2 2.71	2 2.71
Young farmers	3 2.49	3 2.49	2 2.49	3 2.63	3 2.33	3 2.49	3 2.44	3 2.33	2 2.51	3 2.42	3 2.42	3 2.63	3 2.63	3 2.63
Media	4 2.28	4 2.31	5 2.23	4 2.52	8 2.09	4 2.31	6 2.17	5 2.24	4 2.29	6 2.34	6 2.34	5 2.36	5 2.36	5 2.36
General public	5 2.26	5 2.25	4 2.26	7 2.38	6 2.13	5 2.26	4 2.42	7 2.17	5 2.26	4 2.34	4 2.34	4 2.38	4 2.38	4 2.38
High school educators	6 2.20	7 2.18	6 2.21	8 2.36	7 2.09	6 2.19	5 2.25	6 2.20	6 2.20	7 2.23	7 2.23	6 2.34	6 2.34	6 2.34
High school students	7 2.16	8 2.14	7 2.16	6 2.40	13 1.76	12 2.06	7 2.09	9 2.11	7 2.16	8 2.22	8 2.22	7 2.25	7 2.25	7 2.25
Legislators	8 2.13	6 *2.23	10 *2.06	11 2.24	16 1.61	8 2.11	15 1.74	11 2.02	8 2.16	5 2.34	5 2.34	9 2.21	9 2.21	9 2.21
Members	9 2.13	9 2.08	8 2.11	5 2.50	10 2.04	7 2.15	14 1.75	8 2.14	9 2.14	9 2.09	9 2.09	8 2.23	8 2.23	8 2.23
Postsecondary educators	10 2.05	10 2.05	11 2.01	13 2.15	4 2.26	9 2.10	12 1.83	4 2.24	10 2.04	10 2.03	10 2.03	10 2.15	10 2.15	10 2.15
Prospective members	11 2.02	13 1.97	9 2.08	14 2.13	12 1.83	10 2.09	11 1.83	14 1.98	11 2.04	14 1.96	14 1.96	11 2.13	11 2.13	11 2.13
Managers	12 2.01	12 1.99	12 1.96	10 2.28	5 2.21	13 1.98	9 1.87	10 2.04	12 2.01	11 2.02	11 2.02	13 2.05	13 2.05	13 2.05
Postsecondary students	13 1.96	14 1.96	13 1.96	15 2.03	11 1.96	11 2.06	8 1.91	13 2.00	13 1.96	13 2.01	13 2.01	15 2.00	15 2.00	15 2.00
Grade school educators	14 1.94	11 *2.00	14 *1.84	9 2.29	14 1.73	14 1.95	10 1.83	12 2.02	14 1.94	12 2.02	12 2.02	14 2.01	14 2.01	14 2.01
Grade school students	15 1.86	15 *1.93	15 *1.77	12 2.17	17 1.59	15 1.84	13 1.75	15 1.83	15 1.87	15 1.93	15 1.93	16 1.93	16 1.93	16 1.93
Directors	16 1.83	16 *1.88	17 *1.72	16 2.00	9 2.08	16 1.83	16 1.73	16 1.81	16 1.84	16 1.86	16 1.86	12 2.06	12 2.06	12 2.06
Employees	17 1.64	17 *1.54	16 *1.73	17 1.73	15 1.71	17 1.58	17 1.55	17 1.52	17 1.66	17 1.55	17 1.55	17 1.71	17 1.71	17 1.71

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

included legislators and media. MEGM cooperatives gave higher weight to educating high school educators than other groups except for electric cooperatives.

Cooperatives indicated that they should have the primary role of educating their members, managers, directors, and employees. They thought the primary role of AIC, ACS, Extension Service, and State councils' was to educate those audiences outside operating cooperatives.

By Cooperative Size

Respondents were separated into different size classes for the purpose of identifying any differences in their responses to what extent cooperatives or other organizations should be providing cooperative education. This was done for each of the five types of organizations.

Regional and Local Cooperatives. Small cooperatives (sales less than \$10 million) and the largest cooperatives (sales of \$1 billion or more) identified young farmers as the highest priority target audience for cooperative education by regional and local cooperatives. Cooperatives with sales of \$75 to \$999.9 million indicated members and directors as highest priority (table 9). Other rankings and priorities of target audiences for cooperative education by cooperative size were fairly similar.

State Cooperative Organizations. Respondents in each size category identified legislators as the number one target audience for cooperative education by State cooperative organizations. Larger cooperatives even gave greater weight to State organizations educating legislators (table 10).

Cooperatives with sales of \$250 to \$999.9 million gave higher priority to State organizations educating university extension and research personnel and less priority to educating members than by other size groupings of cooperatives. The largest cooperatives gave more weight to State organizations educating county extension agents, postsecondary educators, and grade school educators and students than did smaller cooperatives.

American Institute of Cooperation. Cooperatives with sales less than \$250 million identified media, university extension and research personnel, and legislators as the three most important target audiences for AIC. Cooperatives in the \$250 to \$999.9 million sales range identified legislators, university extension and research personnel, and young farmers as the top three target audiences. For the largest cooperatives, the top three target audiences were university extension and research personnel, media, and postsecondary educators (table 11).

The largest cooperatives also gave lower weight to AIC educating legislators and managers than did the smaller cooperatives. They also believed AIC should be a major provider of education to all target audiences except for grade school students, employees, and prospective members. The smallest cooperatives identified only six target audiences--media, university extension and research personnel, legislators, managers, young farmers, and directors--where AIC should be the major provider of cooperative education.

Cooperatives in every size category believed AIC should be a major or minor provider of education to all target audiences. Even grade school students were included.

Agricultural Cooperative Service. Small cooperatives believed ACS should be the major provider of education to university extension and research personnel, media,

Table 9--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by regional and local cooperatives, by cooperative size

Target Audience	Size grouping					
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.0 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
Rank and weighted average for each group						
Young farmers	1 2.83	3 2.78	3 2.81	5 2.72	6 2.74	1 3.00
Members	2 2.78	1 2.83	1 2.90	2 2.85	1 2.95	2 2.91
Directors	3 2.78	4 2.78	2 2.83	1 2.87	2 2.91	3 2.90
Employees	4 2.77	2 2.81	4 2.81	3 2.76	4 2.86	4 2.86
Prospective members	5 2.71	5 2.75	5 2.78	4 2.73	3 2.91	6 2.85
Managers	6 2.70	6 2.68	6 2.64	7 2.60	5 2.84	5 2.86
Media	7 2.54	7 2.54	7 2.53	8 2.43	8 2.53	7 2.68
County extension agents	8 2.42	10 2.31	10 2.37	10 2.18	10 2.20	9 2.38
General public	9 2.42	9 2.37	9 2.42	9 2.31	11 2.12	10 2.36
Legislators	10 2.41	8 2.43	8 2.46	6 2.62	7 2.70	8 2.52
High school students	11 2.22	11 2.23	12 2.28	11 2.10	15 1.76	11 2.18
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	13 2.06	13 2.10	13 2.06	13 2.01	9 2.33	13 2.14
High school educators	12 2.22	12 2.22	11 2.29	12 2.08	13 1.93	12 2.18
Postsecondary educators	14 1.86	15 1.86	14 1.98	15 1.89	12 1.98	14 2.14
Postsecondary students	15 1.85	17 1.81	15 1.93	14 1.90	14 1.86	15 2.05
Grade school educators	16 1.76	14 1.88	16 1.82	16 1.73	16 1.49	16 1.86
Grade school students	17 1.75	16 1.85	17 1.78	17 1.72	17 1.42	17 1.82

Table 10--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by State cooperative organizations, by cooperative size

Target Audience	Size grouping					
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.0 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
Rank and weighted average for each group						
Legislators	1 2.76	1 2.78	1 2.85	1 2.70	1 2.90	1 3.00
Media	3 2.73	2 2.74	2 2.76	3 2.59	5 2.57	3 2.76
Managers	2 2.74	3 2.71	3 2.65	2 2.62	4 2.59	5 2.62
Directors	5 2.62	4 2.70	5 2.62	5 2.56	6 2.51	7 2.60
Young farmers	4 2.70	5 2.63	4 2.65	4 2.56	3 2.62	2 2.81
Members	7 2.52	6 2.55	6 2.55	6 2.47	10 2.37	6 2.62
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	6 2.53	7 2.51	7 2.55	9 2.32	2 2.64	8 2.48
General public	8 2.47	8 2.48	8 2.46	7 2.39	9 2.39	9 2.48
County extension agents	9 2.47	9 2.38	10 2.44	8 2.37	7 2.43	4 2.65
Employees	10 2.43	11 2.31	11 2.41	10 2.30	14 2.10	14 2.35
High school educators	12 2.31	12 2.27	14 2.20	13 2.20	8 2.40	12 2.35
High school students	13 2.28	13 2.24	15 2.11	15 2.13	13 2.12	13 2.35
Postsecondary educators	14 2.16	14 2.22	12 2.30	12 2.25	12 2.17	10 2.47
Postsecondary students	15 2.07	15 2.12	13 2.24	14 2.20	15 2.00	15 2.26
Prospective members	11 2.38	10 2.37	9 2.46	11 2.26	11 2.33	11 2.43
Grade school educators	16 1.87	16 1.97	16 1.85	16 1.93	16 1.90	16 2.10
Grade school students	17 1.77	17 1.91	17 1.71	17 1.80	17 1.71	17 2.00

Table 11--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by American Institute of Cooperation, by cooperative size

Target Audience	Size groupings					
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.0 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
Rank and weighted average for each group						
Media	1 2.68	3 2.71	1 2.74	2 2.57	5 2.40	2 2.67
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	2 2.62	2 2.72	3 2.57	3 2.43	2 2.52	1 2.71
Legislators	3 2.60	1 2.82	2 2.74	1 2.62	1 2.55	10 2.45
Managers	4 2.59	4 2.58	5 2.48	5 2.36	4 2.43	14 2.38
Young farmers	5 2.56	5 2.48	4 2.50	4 2.40	3 2.50	7 2.52
Directors	6 2.34	6 2.36	8 2.34	8 2.24	8 2.27	8 2.50
General public	7 2.30	7 2.35	6 2.41	7 2.29	10 2.17	4 2.57
County extension agents	8 2.28	11 2.21	9 2.27	10 2.12	13 2.10	6 2.52
Postsecondary educators	9 2.23	9 2.22	7 2.40	6 2.33	6 2.33	3 2.65
High school educators	10 2.21	8 2.24	12 2.08	12 2.02	7 2.33	5 2.52
Members	11 2.17	10 2.21	11 2.14	11 2.11	9 2.19	12 2.43
High school students	12 2.15	14 2.14	15 2.00	13 1.95	12 2.12	9 2.48
Postsecondary students	13 2.14	12 2.15	10 2.25	9 2.18	11 2.14	11 2.45
Employees	14 1.99	15 2.04	14 2.05	15 1.89	15 2.00	16 2.24
Prospective members	15 1.94	13 2.14	13 2.06	14 1.91	16 1.98	17 2.10
Grade school educators	16 1.87	16 1.92	16 1.83	16 1.77	14 2.02	13 2.38
Grade school students	17 1.78	17 1.80	17 1.70	17 1.67	17 1.86	15 2.29

and legislators. The largest cooperatives identified only two audiences--county extension agents and university extension and research personnel. The larger cooperatives also gave much lower priority to ACS educating managers than did smaller cooperatives (table 12).

Cooperatives with sales of \$75 to \$249 million believed ACS should have little or no involvement in educating employees and grade school educators and students. Only the largest cooperatives thought ACS should be a minor provider of education to grade school students.

There were few other differences in priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by ACS in the various size categories.

Extension Service. The Extension Service, according to cooperatives of all size classes, should be a major provider of cooperative education to county extension agents, young farmers, and university extension and research personnel. Cooperatives in the \$10 to \$24.9 million sales range included the general public and legislators. The general public also was included by cooperatives in the next larger sales category. The largest cooperatives also included the general public and high school educators (table 13).

One important response was that cooperatives in each size category gave lowest priority to Extension Service providing education to employees. And only those cooperatives in the \$10 to \$74.9 million range believed the Extension Service should have a minor role in providing education to this group.

By Farm Credit District

The responses to what extent cooperatives and other organizations should be providing educational services to target audiences were also grouped by 12 farm credit districts. This was done to point out any major differences cooperatives may have on who should be providing cooperative education because of their particular location in the country.

Regional and Local Cooperatives. Respondents in each farm credit district indicated regional and local cooperatives should be major providers of education to members, directors, employees, young farmers, prospective members, managers, and media. Ranking of target audiences by respondents in each district, however, was somewhat different. For example, respondents in the Sacramento district gave lower priority to cooperatives educating members than any other district. Prospective members were given lower weights by respondents in Wichita, Texas, and Spokane. Sacramento ranked young farmers eighth (table 14).

Only one district, Louisville, believed cooperatives should not be a major provider of cooperative education to legislators. Six of the twelve districts--Baltimore, Louisville, St. Louis, St. Paul, Omaha, and Spokane--indicated cooperatives should be major providers of education to the general public. Respondents in Baltimore, Columbia, Louisville, St. Louis, and Texas also included county extension agents. Only Baltimore and Texas respondents identified high school students as high-priority target audiences (weighted average 2.34 or above).

Respondents in only two districts--Springfield and Sacramento--indicated cooperatives should have little or no involvement in educating grade school educators and students. Columbia respondents included only grade school students in this category.

Table 12--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by Agricultural Cooperative Service, by cooperative size

Target Audience	Size groupings						
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.0 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more	
Rank and weighted average for each group							
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	1 2.44	2 2.52	3 2.46	1 2.31	1 2.45	2 2.40	
Media	2 2.42	3 2.50	2 2.51	2 2.26	5 2.10	4 2.30	
Legislators	3 2.40	1 2.55	1 2.53	3 2.22	2 2.33	5 2.25	
Managers	4 2.32	6 2.26	6 2.21	7 2.01	7 2.05	13 1.95	
Young farmers	5 2.29	5 2.26	4 2.31	5 2.06	8 2.00	3 2.32	
County extension agents	6 2.27	4 2.36	5 2.26	4 2.15	3 2.33	1 2.47	
General public	7 2.14	7 2.18	8 2.10	9 1.90	6 2.05	8 2.15	
Members	8 1.98	8 2.13	10 1.95	10 1.83	10 1.95	10 2.05	
Directors	9 1.97	12 1.94	11 1.90	12 1.78	11 1.95	12 1.95	
Postsecondary educators	10 1.95	9 1.99	7 2.11	6 2.02	4 2.10	6 2.21	
High school educators	11 1.95	11 1.96	13 1.80	11 1.82	9 1.95	9 2.10	
Postsecondary students	12 1.89	13 1.89	9 1.98	8 1.93	13 1.81	7 2.16	
High school students	13 1.88	14 1.87	14 1.75	14 1.68	16 1.66	11 2.00	
Prospective members	14 1.83	10 1.97	12 1.87	13 1.72	12 1.83	15 1.84	
Employees	15 1.69	15 1.71	15 1.68	16 1.51	14 1.71	17 1.75	
Grade school educators	16 1.68	16 1.69	16 1.56	15 1.64	15 1.69	14 1.90	
Grade school students	17 1.59	17 1.59	17 1.48	17 1.51	17 1.55	16 1.80	

Table 13--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by Extension Service, by cooperative size

Target Audience	Size groupings						
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.0 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more	
Rank and weighted average for each group							
County extension agents	1 2.61	2 2.62	1 2.68	1 2.73	1 2.88	1 2.75	
Young farmers	2 2.50	3 2.45	2 2.61	2 2.43	3 2.50	3 2.50	
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	3 2.41	1 2.62	3 2.48	3 2.42	2 2.83	2 2.55	
Media	4 2.29	4 2.40	5 2.34	5 2.20	7 2.19	6 2.35	
General public	5 2.20	6 2.35	4 2.34	6 2.16	4 2.29	4 2.50	
High school educators	6 2.16	8 2.27	9 2.18	4 2.22	6 2.24	5 2.35	
High school students	7 2.11	7 2.29	6 2.27	8 2.09	12 1.95	7 2.25	
Legislators	8 2.08	5 2.35	8 2.23	9 2.07	11 2.12	13 1.95	
Members	9 2.07	9 2.26	7 2.24	11 1.98	8 2.15	10 2.11	
Managers	10 2.06	14 2.04	13 2.06	13 1.93	13 1.90	15 1.75	
Prospective members	11 1.95	10 2.13	11 2.15	14 1.91	10 2.14	14 1.89	
Postsecondary educators	12 1.86	13 2.05	10 2.15	7 2.16	5 2.26	12 2.05	
Grade school educators	13 1.86	11 2.12	14 1.94	12 1.97	15 1.83	8 2.20	
Directors	14 1.84	16 1.90	16 1.84	16 1.64	14 1.85	16 1.75	
Grade school students	15 1.80	12 2.08	15 1.87	15 1.79	16 1.74	11 2.10	
Postsecondary students	16 1.80	15 1.95	12 2.11	10 2.03	9 2.14	9 2.16	
Employees	17 1.62	17 1.71	17 1.75	17 1.54	17 1.56	17 1.50	

Table 14--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by regional and local cooperatives, by farm credit district

Farm credit district																								
Target Audience	Spring-field	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane												
		Rank and weighted average for each district																						
Members	1	2.97	1	2.86	2	2.89	2	2.83	3	2.68	1	2.83	1	2.90	2	2.85	2	2.85	3	2.86	5	2.65	1	2.89
Prospective members	2	2.96	5	2.74	4	2.83	4	2.79	2	2.74	6	2.73	4	2.77	5	2.78	6	2.63	6	2.62	1	2.79	8	2.58
Directors	3	2.96	2	2.81	3	2.86	5	2.77	6	2.47	2	2.83	3	2.82	1	2.86	1	2.85	1	3.00	2	2.74	3	2.77
Young farmers	4	2.86	3	2.79	5	2.77	3	2.82	1	2.84	3	2.83	5	2.76	4	2.79	3	2.85	5	2.81	8	2.50	2	2.85
Employees	5	2.79	4	2.78	1	2.89	1	2.85	5	2.50	4	2.79	2	2.84	3	2.82	4	2.76	2	2.95	3	2.70	4	2.66
Legislators	6	2.79	8	2.47	7	2.60	10	2.30	7	2.37	8	2.51	8	2.49	8	2.51	8	2.44	7	2.50	4	2.65	5	2.66
Media	7	2.64	7	2.50	8	2.49	7	2.51	8	2.37	7	2.54	7	2.58	7	2.51	7	2.54	9	2.40	7	2.56	7	2.64
Managers	8	2.62	6	2.72	6	2.61	6	2.69	4	2.58	5	2.76	6	2.71	6	2.70	5	2.68	4	2.81	6	2.58	6	2.65
General public	9	2.15	9	2.46	10	2.29	9	2.41	10	2.22	10	2.37	9	2.43	9	2.42	10	2.29	11	2.30	9	2.26	9	2.39
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	10	2.12	17	1.79	11	2.20	13	2.06	11	2.11	13	2.16	13	2.06	13	1.97	12	2.17	14	2.15	11	2.21	12	2.18
County extension agents	11	2.04	10	2.34	9	2.41	8	2.44	9	2.24	9	2.48	11	2.19	11	2.16	9	2.32	8	2.40	10	2.21	10	2.24
Postsecondary students	12	1.92	15	1.94	15	2.00	16	1.77	17	1.89	15	1.83	15	1.94	14	1.84	15	1.88	16	1.90	13	1.89	14	1.94
Postsecondary educators	13	1.88	16	1.89	14	2.09	14	1.85	14	2.00	14	1.89	14	1.97	15	1.83	14	1.98	17	1.85	12	1.95	16	1.85
High school students	14	1.85	11	2.34	13	2.14	12	2.20	13	2.11	12	2.25	12	2.18	12	2.14	13	2.13	10	2.37	15	1.79	11	2.24
High school educators	15	1.81	12	2.28	12	2.17	11	2.25	12	2.11	11	2.26	10	2.21	10	2.17	11	2.23	12	2.25	14	1.84	13	2.12
Grade school educators	16	1.54	13	1.97	16	1.69	15	1.77	15	1.89	16	1.73	16	1.88	16	1.77	16	1.75	15	1.95	16	1.42	17	1.79
Grade school students	17	1.52	14	1.94	17	1.57	17	1.73	16	1.89	17	1.70	17	1.81	17	1.70	17	1.70	13	2.24	17	1.37	15	1.88

State Cooperative Organizations. Respondents in 8 of 12 districts identified legislators as the highest priority target audience for State cooperative organizations. Young farmers were highest priority in Springfield and Jackson. Managers were highest priority in Wichita and Texas (table 15).

Respondents in every district believed the State cooperative organizations should be major providers of education to legislators, young farmers, media, directors, and managers. Only one district--Jackson--excluded members from being in the above group.

University extension and research personnel were also excluded from this group because of the lower priority respondents gave this audience in Jackson and Baltimore districts. Respondents in only five districts identified employees as a high-priority target audience (weighted average of 2.34 and above).

The general public was a major audience in all districts except Springfield, Columbia, and Jackson. Respondents in Sacramento and Baltimore districts gave the general public fairly high priority for cooperative education by State cooperative organizations.

Respondents in only three districts--Baltimore, Spokane, and Sacramento--believed State cooperative organizations should be minor providers of education for prospective members. This target audience, however, was given higher weighted averages in other districts. The situation was similar for county extension agents. Only Springfield and Jackson respondents gave them a weighted average less than 2.34.

Respondents in only half of the districts indicated State cooperative organizations should be major providers of education to postsecondary educators. Three districts included postsecondary students in this category.

Only two districts, Texas and Sacramento, believed State cooperative organizations should be major providers of education to both high school educators and students.

American Institute of Cooperation. Responses on the extent AIC should be providing education to target audiences varied considerably. Respondents in Springfield and Jackson ranked young farmers as the number one target audience. Media was the highest priority in St. Louis, Omaha, and Sacramento districts. Louisville and Spokane indicated highest priority for university extension and research personnel. Legislators were highest priority in Columbia, St. Paul, and Texas; Wichita identified managers; and Baltimore gave postsecondary educators highest priority (table 16).

All districts indicated AIC should be a major provider of cooperative education to media, university extension and research personnel, and legislators. All except Columbia and Omaha would have included young farmers in this category. Managers were also a major audience except for Jackson district. Springfield, St. Paul, Texas, and Sacramento gave high-priority (2.34 or above) to AIC providing education to directors.

Agricultural Cooperative Service. Respondents in six districts believed university extension and research personnel should be the highest priority target audience for ACS. Respondents in all but Springfield and Jackson districts thought ACS should be a major provider of education to this particular audience (table 17).

Legislators were considered highest priority for ACS by respondents in Springfield, Jackson, and St. Louis. Respondents in eight districts thought ACS should be a

Table 15--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by State cooperative organizations, by farm credit district

Farm credit district												
Target Audience	Springfield	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane
Rank and weighted average for each district												
Young farmers	1 2.70	3 2.59	2 2.67	4 2.65	1 2.83	5 2.58	5 2.67	5 2.61	4 2.68	3 2.90	6 2.63	2 2.73
Legislators	2 2.67	1 2.79	1 2.73	1 2.74	2 2.50	1 2.75	1 2.91	1 2.92	2 2.76	4 2.89	1 3.00	1 2.76
Media	3 2.59	2 2.61	3 2.64	2 2.71	3 2.44	2 2.72	3 2.77	2 2.81	5 2.61	6 2.79	2 2.74	3 2.72
Members	4 2.54	7 2.52	8 2.36	7 2.56	8 2.33	6 2.52	8 2.57	7 2.50	8 2.49	9 2.70	13 2.35	8 2.50
Directors	5 2.50	8 2.50	6 2.44	5 2.59	5 2.42	4 2.60	4 2.70	4 2.70	3 2.73	2 2.95	4 2.63	4 2.65
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	6 2.44	12 2.33	7 2.42	6 2.57	9 2.31	7 2.48	6 2.60	10 2.43	6 2.59	7 2.75	8 2.42	6 2.53
Prospective members	7 2.42	13 2.27	9 2.35	11 2.34	4 2.44	11 2.34	11 2.41	11 2.40	9 2.39	12 2.50	14 2.16	10 2.33
Managers	8 2.42	4 2.53	4 2.50	3 2.69	6 2.41	3 2.69	2 2.82	3 2.77	1 2.80	1 3.00	7 2.53	5 2.64
County extension agents	9 2.26	9 2.47	5 2.44	10 2.37	13 2.11	8 2.44	12 2.38	9 2.43	7 2.49	5 2.79	3 2.65	7 2.50
Postsecondary educators	10 2.25	11 2.36	14 2.03	13 2.12	14 2.06	14 2.19	10 2.45	14 2.22	13 2.10	11 2.53	9 2.40	12 2.22
Postsecondary students	11 2.21	15 2.19	15 1.94	15 2.01	15 2.06	15 2.09	14 2.34	15 2.17	15 1.95	15 2.37	12 2.37	13 2.19
General public	12 2.20	5 2.52	10 2.33	9 2.43	7 2.33	9 2.43	7 2.59	6 2.52	10 2.37	13 2.47	5 2.63	9 2.45
High school educators	13 2.20	6 2.52	13 2.09	12 2.17	10 2.18	12 2.25	13 2.37	12 2.31	12 2.18	8 2.70	10 2.37	14 2.15
High school students	14 2.20	10 2.45	12 2.15	14 2.09	11 2.12	13 2.19	15 2.30	13 2.23	14 2.03	14 2.47	11 2.37	11 2.27
Employees	15 2.08	14 2.24	11 2.23	8 2.48	12 2.11	10 2.36	9 2.47	8 2.46	11 2.24	10 2.68	15 2.15	15 2.13
Grade school educators	16 2.04	16 2.16	16 1.73	16 1.86	17 1.59	16 1.78	16 2.11	16 1.87	16 1.93	17 2.20	16 1.84	16 1.94
Grade school students	17 1.92	17 1.97	17 1.64	17 1.73	16 1.71	17 1.70	17 1.91	17 1.74	17 1.73	16 2.21	17 1.79	17 1.91

Table 16--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by American Institute of Cooperation, by farm credit district

Farm credit district

Target Audience	Springfield	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane
	Rank and weighted average for each district											
Young farmers	1 2.80	4 2.62	5 2.30	4 2.57	1 2.58	5 2.49	8 2.39	6 2.32	4 2.55	4 2.63	4 2.55	4 2.55
Media	2 2.63	3 2.65	2 2.45	3 2.64	2 2.42	1 2.71	3 2.65	1 2.79	2 2.60	2 2.68	1 2.63	3 2.68
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	3 2.63	5 2.56	3 2.45	1 2.71	4 2.39	4 2.57	2 2.66	3 2.55	3 2.58	3 2.63	6 2.47	1 2.69
Directors	4 2.62	13 2.18	6 2.25	6 2.33	6 2.22	8 2.30	5 2.42	7 2.30	6 2.30	5 2.58	7 2.37	10 2.23
Legislators	5 2.58	8 2.47	1 2.52	2 2.68	3 2.41	2 2.66	1 2.68	2 2.72	5 2.50	1 2.84	3 2.58	2 2.68
Managers	6 2.52	10 2.39	4 2.38	5 2.48	7 2.21	3 2.57	4 2.60	4 2.53	1 2.62	7 2.55	5 2.50	5 2.48
Members	7 2.52	15 2.15	12 2.09	11 2.13	14 2.05	9 2.24	10 2.19	13 2.00	9 2.20	10 2.39	9 2.25	11 2.17
Postsecondary educators	8 2.52	1 2.78	11 2.12	7 2.30	9 2.17	7 2.33	6 2.41	10 2.12	10 2.13	6 2.58	13 2.00	6 2.42
Postsecondary students	9 2.44	6 2.52	13 2.06	12 2.13	13 2.06	11 2.23	9 2.32	14 2.00	14 1.90	11 2.37	12 2.11	8 2.32
County extension agents	10 2.44	12 2.30	9 2.13	8 2.28	8 2.20	10 2.24	12 2.11	8 2.22	7 2.25	12 2.21	8 2.25	7 2.32
General public	11 2.38	7 2.51	8 2.15	9 2.24	5 2.32	6 2.35	7 2.41	5 2.43	8 2.20	13 2.21	2 2.58	9 2.31
High school students	12 2.36	9 2.45	10 2.12	13 2.09	12 2.11	14 2.01	13 2.11	11 2.01	13 1.95	8 2.53	10 2.21	13 2.03
High school educators	13 2.33	2 2.69	7 2.21	10 2.17	11 2.11	12 2.10	11 2.17	9 2.18	11 2.10	9 2.50	11 2.16	14 2.00
Prospective members	14 2.26	17 1.84	15 1.94	15 1.92	10 2.16	15 1.98	15 2.06	12 2.01	12 2.03	16 2.11	17 1.84	12 2.13
Employees	15 2.17	16 1.97	14 1.97	14 2.08	15 2.00	13 2.01	14 2.07	15 1.99	15 1.88	14 2.16	14 1.95	15 1.93
Grade school educators	16 2.07	11 2.31	16 1.85	16 1.85	16 1.89	16 1.77	16 1.97	16 1.84	16 1.85	17 2.06	15 1.89	16 1.80
Grade school students	17 2.04	14 2.16	17 1.64	17 1.78	17 1.78	17 1.67	17 1.86	17 1.72	17 1.51	15 2.11	16 1.84	17 1.70

Table 17--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by Agricultural Cooperative Service, by farm credit district

Farm credit district														
Target Audience	Springfield	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane		
Rank and weighted average for each district														
Legislators	1 2.30	6 2.33	2 2.38	2 2.34	1 2.33	1 2.44	3 2.49	2 2.34	3 2.41	7 2.32	2 2.39	3 2.47		
Young farmers	2 2.24	8 2.25	7 2.16	4 2.16	5 2.22	5 2.17	6 2.30	6 2.07	6 2.23	1 2.67	5 2.17	5 2.39		
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	3 2.23	4 2.41	1 2.50	1 2.39	3 2.28	2 2.40	1 2.66	1 2.37	2 2.44	3 2.47	1 2.44	1 2.60		
Media	4 2.15	1 2.58	3 2.31	3 2.32	2 2.33	3 2.37	2 2.54	3 2.31	1 2.51	5 2.40	3 2.28	4 2.47		
County extension agents	5 2.13	2 2.42	6 2.16	5 2.15	4 2.26	4 2.36	4 2.36	4 2.20	4 2.40	10 2.28	4 2.21	2 2.52		
Managers	6 2.12	9 2.13	5 2.18	6 2.13	7 2.06	6 2.14	5 2.34	5 2.19	5 2.39	4 2.44	7 2.11	6 2.28		
Members	7 2.12	14 1.94	12 1.94	9 1.90	10 2.00	7 2.03	11 2.00	11 1.81	8 1.97	8 2.32	12 1.79	9 2.10		
Postsecondary educators	8 2.12	5 2.36	8 2.09	12 1.77	14 1.61	8 2.00	8 2.18	10 1.81	10 1.90	2 2.52	6 2.16	8 2.14		
Directors	9 2.08	12 2.03	9 2.00	11 1.83	8 2.00	11 1.88	10 2.01	13 1.79	9 1.92	13 2.06	9 1.94	12 2.00		
General public	10 1.96	3 2.41	14 1.94	7 2.08	9 2.00	9 1.99	7 2.22	7 2.04	7 2.21	12 2.16	8 2.11	7 2.17		
High school educators	11 1.88	10 2.09	4 2.22	10 1.84	13 1.61	12 1.82	12 1.96	8 1.91	11 1.79	6 2.37	11 1.89	13 1.87		
Postsecondary students	12 1.88	7 2.25	13 1.94	8 1.95	12 1.67	10 1.94	9 2.15	14 1.76	13 1.69	9 2.29	10 1.94	10 2.10		
Prospective members	13 1.88	15 1.80	11 1.94	13 1.76	6 2.17	13 1.78	14 1.90	9 1.84	12 1.77	16 2.00	16 1.61	11 2.03		
High school students	14 1.81	11 2.03	10 1.97	15 1.67	15 1.56	14 1.75	13 1.93	12 1.79	14 1.66	11 2.28	13 1.78	14 1.87		
Employees	15 1.75	16 1.75	15 1.80	14 1.72	11 1.83	15 1.62	15 1.75	17 1.59	16 1.62	17 1.78	17 1.33	15 1.62		
Grade school educators	16 1.69	13 1.94	16 1.75	16 1.54	16 1.53	16 1.52	16 1.75	15 1.71	15 1.63	14 2.00	14 1.74	16 1.62		
Grade school students	17 1.58	17 1.73	17 1.69	17 1.47	17 1.47	17 1.48	17 1.65	16 1.61	17 1.37	15 2.00	15 1.61	17 1.48		

major provider of education to legislators. In Baltimore and Texas districts, respondents gave relatively higher priority to other target audiences for education by ACS than did respondents in other districts.

Respondents in Baltimore and Wichita identified media as the highest priority target audience for ACS cooperative education. Altogether, respondents in six districts believed ACS should be a major provider of education to media.

Respondents in only one district--Texas--believed young farmers should be highest priority target audience for cooperative education by ACS. Only Texas and Spokane respondents thought ACS should be a major provider of education to young farmers. Respondents in other districts identified ACS as a minor provider of education to young farmers.

In most cases, respondents in each district believed ACS should be at least a minor provider of education to almost all target audiences. In five districts, respondents thought ACS should have little or no involvement in educating both grade school educators and students.

Extension Service. Respondents in 11 districts ranked county extension agents as the highest priority target audience for cooperative education by the (State and Federal) Extension Service. Respondents in Sacramento ranked university extension and research personnel highest priority (table 18).

Respondents in almost all districts believed Extension Service should be a major provider of education to county extension agents, young farmers, and university extension and research personnel. Respondents in only three districts--Jackson, St. Paul, and Spokane--considered the Extension Service as a major provider of cooperative education to the general public.

Respondents in seven districts believed Extension Service should have little or no involvement in educating employees.

Important AIC Activities

Cooperatives surveyed were asked to indicate importance AIC should place on each of 20 activities listed on the survey form. Respondents identified each activity as "very important," "somewhat important," or "unimportant." Again, the responses were weighted and summarized for selected groups of cooperatives, by cooperative size, and by farm credit district.

An activity with a weighted average of 2.34 and above was "very important." A weighted average of 2.33 to 1.67 identified the activity as "somewhat important." An activity with 1.66 or less was identified as "unimportant" to AIC.

Selected Groups

All respondents believed "promoting cooperatives" was the most important activity for AIC. Other very important activities (12 in total) are listed in table 19.

Only two groups, State cooperative councils and mixed structure cooperatives, did not consider promoting cooperatives as the most important AIC activity. State cooperative councils considered education materials development as number one activity. Mixed structure cooperatives ranked coordination with State cooperative organizations as AIC's most important activity.

Table 18--Priority of target audiences for cooperative education provided by Extension Service, by farm credit district

Farm credit district

Target Audience	Springfield	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane
Rank and weighted average for each district												
County extension agents	1 2.45	1 2.80	1 2.79	1 2.66	1 2.75	1 2.70	1 2.69	1 2.56	1 2.64	1 2.95	2 2.61	1 2.62
Young farmers	2 2.37	2 2.53	3 2.52	2 2.45	2 2.63	3 2.57	4 2.43	3 2.34	2 2.56	2 2.78	3 2.53	3 2.55
General public	3 2.23	6 2.19	6 2.15	4 2.33	3 2.50	7 2.25	5 2.36	6 2.17	5 2.15	10 2.22	7 2.17	5 2.37
Univ. ext. & res. personnel	4 2.22	3 2.47	2 2.59	3 2.34	5 2.26	2 2.60	2 2.65	2 2.45	4 2.36	3 2.74	1 2.72	2 2.57
High school educators	5 2.21	4 2.28	4 2.39	6 2.11	6 2.22	6 2.29	7 2.23	8 2.13	9 1.97	8 2.33	8 2.17	9 2.23
Members	6 2.16	10 2.00	9 2.12	8 2.01	7 2.22	5 2.30	9 2.20	14 1.87	8 2.08	6 2.40	13 2.00	6 2.34
Media	7 2.15	9 2.00	7 2.15	5 2.15	4 2.26	4 2.36	3 2.44	4 2.20	3 2.49	4 2.67	10 2.12	4 2.43
High school students	8 2.11	5 2.23	5 2.24	7 2.07	9 2.17	8 2.24	8 2.20	7 2.13	10 1.95	11 2.18	11 2.11	10 2.23
Grade school educators	9 2.04	7 2.16	15 1.79	13 1.84	14 1.94	14 2.00	14 2.01	11 1.93	14 1.87	14 2.06	14 1.89	16 1.83
Legislators	10 2.00	11 1.97	12 2.03	9 1.99	10 2.12	9 2.19	6 2.24	5 2.18	7 2.08	5 2.44	9 2.17	8 2.31
Prospective members	11 1.96	14 1.87	10 2.09	10 1.99	8 2.22	11 2.08	12 2.10	9 1.98	11 1.92	16 2.06	16 1.83	13 2.07
Grade school students	12 1.86	13 1.90	16 1.79	15 1.77	15 1.94	15 1.91	15 1.96	15 1.86	15 1.74	15 2.06	15 1.83	15 1.87
Postsecondary educators	13 1.81	8 2.03	8 2.15	11 1.91	12 2.06	10 2.08	11 2.15	10 1.96	12 1.90	9 2.33	4 2.33	7 2.34
Managers	14 1.76	16 1.74	11 2.06	12 1.87	16 1.89	12 2.06	10 2.19	13 1.88	6 2.13	7 2.39	12 2.11	11 2.21
Directors	15 1.73	15 1.75	14 1.81	17 1.74	11 2.11	16 1.84	16 1.84	16 1.72	13 1.87	13 2.11	6 2.17	14 1.93
Postsecondary students	16 1.65	12 1.97	13 2.00	14 1.83	13 2.06	13 2.05	13 2.06	12 1.91	16 1.72	12 2.17	5 2.33	12 2.14
Employees	17 1.64	17 1.53	17 1.65	16 1.74	17 1.83	17 1.66	17 1.67	17 1.53	17 1.54	17 1.83	17 1.47	17 1.62

Table 19--Importance AIC should place on activities, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups

Activity	Marketing, supply, & service co-ops			Telephone and Electric co-ops		State Co-op Councils		Regional & inter-regional co-ops		Mixed structure co-ops		Federated co-ops		Centralized co-ops		Grain marketing co-ops		All market ing co-ops except grain				
	All co-ops	co-ops	co-ops	Credit co-ops	Electric co-ops	Co-op Councils	State Co-op Councils	Regional co-ops	Mixed structure co-ops	Federated co-ops	Centralized co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	All market ing co-ops except grain									
Rank and weighted average for each group																						
Promoting cooperatives	1	2.83	1	2.85	1	2.81	1	2.80	5	2.80	1	2.82	4	2.58	1	2.83	1	2.84	1	2.85	1	2.82
Coordinate with State organizations	2	2.71	3	2.71	3	2.67	2	2.75	2	2.96	4	2.68	1	2.73	5	2.69	2	2.71	3	2.71	3	2.67
Coordinate with other national co-op assoc	3	2.69	4	2.68	2	2.69	3	2.75	9	2.72	3	2.68	3	2.62	4	2.71	3	2.69	4	2.70	5	2.57
Young farmer education	4	2.67	2	2.77	5	2.58	7	2.52	8	2.73	2	2.71	8	2.46	7	2.67	4	2.68	2	2.77	2	2.74
Education materials development	5	2.62	5	2.64	7	2.56	4	2.63	1	2.96	6	2.64	6	2.50	2	2.75	5	2.61	5	2.63	4	2.65
Work with general farm organizations	6	2.56	10	2.52	4	2.61	5	2.63	14	2.28	11	2.41	13	2.23	12	2.35	6	2.59	9	2.52	10	2.49
Work with professional associations	7	2.55	8	2.54	6	2.58	8	2.50	11	2.52	9	2.50	7	2.46	9	2.38	7	2.57	6	2.59	9	2.52
Central clearinghouse 1/	8	2.54	7	2.57	8	2.48	9	2.50	3	2.88	5	2.68	2	2.65	3	2.71	8	2.52	7	2.57	7	2.55
Youth education	9	2.51	6	2.57	11	2.42	6	2.54	6	2.77	7	2.61	5	2.50	8	2.60	9	2.51	8	2.55	8	2.54
Education materials distribution	10	2.51	9	2.53	9	2.47	10	2.46	4	2.81	8	2.58	9	2.38	6	2.67	10	2.50	10	2.51	6	2.55
Encourage co-op research	11	2.41	11	2.38	12	2.40	11	2.45	7	2.76	15	2.28	12	2.24	13	2.35	11	2.42	14	2.34	12	2.38
Work with internat. co-op. org. 2/	12	2.36	14	2.33	10	2.44	13	2.33	19	2.00	19	2.11	18	2.08	20	1.98	12	2.41	11	2.37	16	2.23
Member education	13	2.32	13	2.37	13	2.28	14	2.31	17	2.16	10	2.41	11	2.31	14	2.33	13	2.32	13	2.36	13	2.34
Director education	14	2.30	12	2.38	15	2.21	16	2.30	15	2.28	12	2.37	17	2.15	10	2.38	14	2.30	12	2.36	11	2.38
General communications (newsletters, etc.)	15	2.27	15	2.28	14	2.22	15	2.30	10	2.62	13	2.36	14	2.19	11	2.38	15	2.27	15	2.26	14	2.33
Management training and development	16	2.18	17	2.23	16	2.09	17	2.27	13	2.31	14	2.32	10	2.31	16	2.27	16	2.17	16	2.19	15	2.33
Education for support professionals 3/	17	2.15	16	2.25	17	2.04	18	2.14	16	2.16	17	2.17	19	2.08	18	2.08	17	2.16	18	2.16	17	2.22
Employee education	18	2.13	18	2.17	18	2.02	12	2.38	18	2.04	16	2.26	15	2.19	17	2.17	18	2.12	17	2.17	18	2.18
Yearbook (American Cooperation)	19	1.99	20	2.05	19	1.90	20	1.85	12	2.50	18	2.17	16	2.15	15	2.29	20	1.96	20	2.02	20	1.97
Director certification	20	1.97	19	2.06	20	1.87	19	1.98	20	1.84	20	1.97	20	1.73	19	1.96	19	1.98	19	2.06	19	2.03

Rank and weighted average for each group

1/ For education and training materials.

2/ Work with international co-op organizations such as ACDI.

3/ Includes lawyers, etc.

* Indicates a statistically significant difference at the 95-percent confidence level between marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives and credit cooperatives.

State cooperative councils and mixed structure cooperatives gave much lower weight to AIC working with general farm organizations than did MSRS and credit cooperatives. They, however, gave higher weight to AIC being a central clearinghouse for education and training materials. State cooperative councils also gave higher weight to "general communications" and "Yearbook" as important activities than did other selected groups.

By Cooperative Size

Respondents in every size group except one (those with sales of \$250 to \$999.9 million) identified promoting cooperatives as the highest AIC priority. Respondents in the group with sales of \$250 to \$999.9 million identified AIC's most important activity as a central clearinghouse for education and training materials. This group also gave lower priority to AIC working with the general farm organizations than did other size groups (table 20).

The largest cooperatives gave lower priority to AIC encouraging cooperative research, director education, and director certification than did smaller cooperatives. They gave greater weight, however, to AIC's yearbook than did respondents in other size groupings.

By Farm Credit District

Promoting cooperatives was the most important activity for AIC in eight farm credit districts. In Baltimore and Spokane districts, respondents identified the most important activity as coordination with State organizations. Youth education was most important in Jackson and coordination with other national cooperative associations was most important in Omaha (table 21).

Spokane was the only district that did not consider AIC being a central clearinghouse for education and training materials very important. Respondents in Spokane and Texas districts gave higher weight and ranking to encouraging cooperative research than did the other districts. Texas and Sacramento respondents believed work with international cooperative organizations was less important than did respondents in other districts.

Methods AIC Should Use In Educational Efforts

Respondents were asked to identify methods AIC should use to be most effective in conducting activities. These methods included (1) conferences, workshops, and institutes (CWI), (2) educational materials, and (3) educational consulting services. Respondents were also asked to indicate which activities were not appropriate for AIC.

Responses to what method AIC should use for conducting each activity were summarized and divided by the total number of respondents to convert to percentages for comparison and analysis.

Conferences, Workshops, and Institutes

Selected Groups. More than two-thirds of all respondents believed AIC should use conferences, workshops, and institutes (CWI) to educate young farmers. This was true for all selected groups except for mixed structure and electric cooperatives. Only 55.9 percent of the electric cooperatives believed this method should be used in educating young farmers (table 22).

Table 20--Importance AIC should place on activities, by cooperative size

Activity	Size groupings					
	Less than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.9 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
	Rank and weighted average for each group					
Promoting cooperatives	1 2.84	1 2.85	1 2.85	1 2.79	2 2.72	1 2.82
Coordinate with State organizations	2 2.73	3 2.76	2 2.72	3 2.59	6 2.59	2 2.68
Coordinate with other national co-op associations	3 2.69	2 2.79	3 2.71	2 2.61	7 2.56	3 2.68
Young farmer education	4 2.69	4 2.71	4 2.68	4 2.58	5 2.65	9 2.55
Work with general farm organizations	5 2.64	7 2.59	7 2.61	6 2.52	10 2.30	10 2.55
Education materials development	6 2.60	5 2.63	6 2.62	5 2.53	3 2.72	4 2.64
Work with professional associations	7 2.54	6 2.62	5 2.63	8 2.48	9 2.44	6 2.59
Youth education	8 2.52	9 2.50	9 2.53	10 2.40	8 2.51	8 2.59
Central clearinghouse for education and training materials	9 2.47	8 2.58	11 2.48	7 2.50	1 2.74	5 2.59
Education materials distribution	10 2.47	10 2.48	8 2.54	9 2.43	4 2.67	7 2.59
Encourage cooperative research	11 2.44	12 2.40	12 2.44	12 2.38	12 2.21	15 2.29
Work with international co-op organizations (ACDI)	12 2.37	11 2.45	10 2.48	11 2.39	20 1.86	14 2.32
Director education	13 2.36	14 2.31	15 2.28	14 2.21	11 2.26	18 2.14
Member education	14 2.30	13 2.38	13 2.37	13 2.30	13 2.21	12 2.36
General communications (newsletters, etc.)	15 2.30	16 2.23	14 2.30	15 2.21	14 2.16	13 2.36
Management training and development	16 2.21	17 2.16	16 2.20	17 2.11	17 2.12	16 2.23
Employee education	17 2.16	18 2.15	17 2.14	18 2.01	18 2.05	17 2.18
Education for support professionals (i.e. lawyers, etc.)	18 2.14	15 2.27	18 2.04	16 2.15	16 2.14	19 2.09
Director certification	19 2.01	19 2.01	19 2.03	20 1.87	19 1.88	20 1.68
Yearbook (American Cooperation)	20 1.96	20 1.95	20 1.90	19 1.94	15 2.14	11 2.36

Table 21--Importance AIC should place on activities, by farm credit district

Farm credit district												
Activity	Springfield	Baltimore	Columbia	Louisville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacramento	Spokane
	Rank and weighted average for each district											
Promoting cooperatives	1 2.86	2 2.76	1 2.84	1 2.89	3 2.77	1 2.86	1 2.82	3 2.72	1 2.85	1 2.77	1 2.76	2 2.88
Education materials development	2 2.69	3 2.73	10 2.47	5 2.69	9 2.55	5 2.61	5 2.61	4 2.60	7 2.54	8 2.50	3 2.64	5 2.67
Central clearinghouse 1/	3 2.66	4 2.68	7 2.56	8 2.59	8 2.55	9 2.47	9 2.52	9 2.45	5 2.66	3 2.55	4 2.62	15 2.32
Education materials distribution	4 2.66	6 2.62	11 2.47	10 2.55	10 2.36	8 2.53	6 2.55	8 2.48	9 2.46	15 2.27	7 2.50	9 2.42
Young farmer education	5 2.66	7 2.62	4 2.68	2 2.77	2 2.82	7 2.60	3 2.68	7 2.52	2 2.78	2 2.64	2 2.71	4 2.71
Coordinate with other associations 2/	6 2.62	5 2.68	2 2.78	3 2.75	6 2.64	3 2.66	4 2.63	1 2.79	3 2.71	6 2.50	8 2.48	3 2.79
Work with general farm organizations	7 2.62	13 2.35	5 2.58	7 2.64	5 2.68	2 2.68	10 2.52	5 2.58	12 2.34	11 2.41	10 2.38	7 2.48
Youth education	8 2.62	8 2.57	6 2.58	6 2.66	1 2.82	12 2.37	8 2.54	11 2.32	6 2.59	12 2.41	6 2.57	12 2.38
Work with professional associations	9 2.59	9 2.54	9 2.53	9 2.57	7 2.59	6 2.61	7 2.54	6 2.56	8 2.51	9 2.45	9 2.48	8 2.48
Coordinate with state organizations	10 2.55	1 2.81	3 2.77	4 2.72	4 2.68	4 2.65	2 2.74	2 2.72	4 2.68	4 2.55	5 2.60	1 2.88
Management training and development	11 2.52	11 2.35	19 2.00	18 2.19	16 2.23	18 2.04	16 2.16	18 2.04	14 2.27	13 2.36	12 2.33	11 2.38
Member education	12 2.52	12 2.35	14 2.30	13 2.38	14 2.32	13 2.35	13 2.30	15 2.18	15 2.27	10 2.41	14 2.19	16 2.26
Director education	13 2.48	10 2.38	17 2.05	15 2.30	11 2.36	15 2.22	14 2.29	13 2.30	11 2.37	7 2.50	13 2.23	10 2.41
Encourage cooperative research	14 2.41	15 2.27	8 2.53	11 2.45	9 2.45	11 2.40	11 2.48	12 2.31	10 2.43	5 2.55	17 2.00	6 2.55
Work with internat. co-op org. 3/	15 2.31	17 2.27	12 2.42	12 2.39	13 2.36	10 2.45	12 2.37	10 2.39	13 2.29	19 2.14	15 2.14	14 2.36
General communications 4/	16 2.21	16 2.27	13 2.39	14 2.38	15 2.27	14 2.28	15 2.26	17 2.06	17 2.17	14 2.32	11 2.33	13 2.36
Education for support professionals 5/	17 2.14	14 2.27	16 2.17	17 2.19	20 1.91	17 2.05	18 2.13	14 2.25	16 2.20	16 2.27	18 1.91	17 2.18
Employee education	18 2.07	18 2.22	18 2.03	16 2.22	17 2.14	16 2.08	17 2.15	16 2.12	19 2.07	17 2.18	16 2.05	19 2.03
Yearbook (American Cooperation)	19 2.04	19 2.19	15 2.28	20 1.94	19 2.00	19 1.98	19 2.08	20 1.85	20 1.98	20 1.95	19 1.90	20 1.88
Director certification	20 2.00	20 2.11	20 1.92	19 1.98	18 2.05	20 1.85	20 1.86	19 2.00	18 2.07	18 2.14	20 1.86	18 2.15

1/ For education and training materials.

2/ National cooperative associations.

3/ Work with international co-op organizations such as ACDI.

4/ Newsletters, etc.

5/ Lawyers, etc.

Table 22--Activities where AIC should use conferences, workshops, and institutes, by all respondents and selected groups

Activity	All cooperatives and selected groups									
	All co-ops	Marketing supply, & service co-ops	Telephone and Electric co-ops	State Co-op Councils	Regional co-ops	Mixed structure co-ops	Federated co-ops	Centralized co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	All marketing co-ops except grain
Percent of total in each group										
Young farmers education	68.5	72.1	66.4	55.9	76.9	76.6	65.4	69.4	68.6	67.9
Director education	65.2	62.6	68.0	71.2	53.8	65.8	46.2	65.3	66.1	58.8
Management training and development	64.3	63.6	66.0	62.7	57.7	62.2	53.8	57.1	65.4	63.4
Work with extension and educators	57.5	58.8	55.5	52.5	73.1	65.8	57.7	63.3	57.0	60.3
Employee education	51.8	47.6	55.9	57.6	46.2	55.0	46.2	63.3	51.1	48.1
Youth education	51.5	53.7	46.9	49.2	76.9	63.1	57.7	61.2	50.4	48.1
Work with professional associations	50.7	52.4	50.0	40.7	61.5	53.2	42.3	44.9	51.6	43.5
Work with universities	49.9	54.8	47.3	30.5	65.4	58.6	53.8	57.1	49.1	45.8
Cooperative image building	46.8	45.6	50.8	35.6	46.2	41.4	38.5	40.8	47.7	50.4
Director certification	46.0	47.3	45.7	45.8	34.6	46.6	26.9	34.7	47.9	47.3
Work with general farm organizations	45.0	46.6	45.7	39.0	34.6	40.5	26.9	36.7	46.6	48.1
Affiliated professionals education	37.3	42.9	31.3	28.8	53.8	41.4	26.9	36.7	37.9	42.0
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	35.6	33.3	40.2	28.8	30.8	24.3	11.5	20.4	38.0	35.1
Educate and inform legislators	35.4	37.1	38.3	25.4	11.5	33.3	15.4	30.6	36.8	34.4
Work with media	33.7	36.4	34.8	22.0	19.2	29.7	15.4	20.4	35.7	34.4
Member education	28.5	26.9	31.3	27.1	23.1	36.0	23.1	38.8	27.9	22.1
Educate general public	16.2	17.0	11.7	28.8	23.1	13.5	11.5	16.3	16.4	18.3
										17.7

Nearly 77 percent of State cooperative councils thought AIC should use CWI to educate young farmers and youth. At least a majority of respondents in each group except one, identified CWI to be most effective in educating young farmers, director education, and management training and development and work with extension and educators. Only 46.2 percent of respondents from mixed structure cooperatives believed this method most effective in educating directors.

By Cooperative Size. A larger percent of the larger cooperatives thought AIC should use CWI to educate young farmers and to work with extension and educators than did smaller cooperatives (table 23).

Overall, the responses of the largest cooperatives appeared to be somewhat different from responses of smaller size cooperatives. Only 45.5 percent of the largest cooperatives thought AIC should use CWI in educating directors compared with 60.4 to 73.5 percent of the smaller groups. Only 9.1 percent of the largest cooperatives believed AIC should use CWI in working with international cooperative organizations, compared with 25 to 40.2 percent of the cooperatives in other groups.

By Farm Credit District. In every farm credit district, at least 55 percent of respondents believed AIC should use CWI for conducting director education, management training and development, and young farmers education. In Jackson, 90.9 percent of respondents indicated CWI should be used to educate young farmers. From 46 to 73 percent of respondents in all districts thought CWI should be used to work with extension and educators (table 24).

For some activities, the percentage of respondents that thought AIC should use CWI varied considerably. For example, 37.5 and 77.3 percent of respondents in Omaha and Jackson, respectively, believed CWI should be used to educate youth.

Educational Materials

Selected Groups. Seventy-one percent or more of respondents in each group believed AIC should use educational materials to educate the general public and members and to build cooperative image. At least a majority of respondents in each group believed AIC should use educational materials for educating youth, media, legislators, young farmers, professional associations, universities, extension and educators, and employees (table 25).

Nearly two-thirds or more of the credit cooperatives thought AIC should use educational materials to educate young farmers and directors and for management training and development. By comparison, more than 80 percent of the State councils believed AIC should use educational materials to educate youth and the general public, for cooperative image building, to educate young farmers, to work with universities, and to educate directors and members.

By Cooperative Size. A larger percentage of larger cooperatives believed educational materials should be used in working with extension and educators, universities, general farm organizations, and youth and young farmer education than did smaller cooperatives (table 26). More than two-thirds of respondents in each size grouping believed educational materials should be used to educate the general public, for member education, and for cooperative image building.

By Farm Credit District. At least 50 percent or more of respondents in each farm credit district thought AIC should use educational materials to (1) educate youth, (2) educate members, (3) educate the general public, (4) educate young farmers, (5) work with universities, (6) educate and inform legislators, (7) work with

Table 23--Activities where AIC should use conferences, workshops, and institutes, by cooperative size

Activity	Size groupings					
	Less					
	than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.9 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
Percent of total in each group						
Young farmers education	69.8	61.3	68.4	70.4	72.7	72.7
Management training and development	62.7	66.4	67.5	65.3	63.6	54.5
Director education	60.4	64.7	68.4	73.5	70.5	45.5
Work with extension and educators	55.7	55.5	59.8	52.0	65.9	72.7
Employee education	52.4	48.7	53.8	46.9	61.4	50.0
Work with universities	52.4	43.7	47.9	51.0	56.8	54.5
Work with professional associations	50.9	51.3	52.1	48.0	50.0	59.1
Director certification	47.6	43.7	47.0	50.0	38.6	36.4
Youth education	46.7	47.1	48.7	56.1	59.1	68.2
Work with general farm organizations	46.7	44.5	52.1	41.8	34.1	36.4
Cooperative image building	46.2	48.7	50.4	42.9	36.4	59.1
Affiliated professionals education	38.2	40.3	32.5	32.7	38.6	45.5
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	37.3	37.0	40.2	35.7	25.0	9.1
Educate and inform legislators	34.0	41.2	36.8	32.7	38.6	31.8
Work with media	33.5	37.0	34.2	34.7	38.6	27.3
Member education	26.4	26.1	28.2	30.6	40.9	27.3
Educate general public	17.9	18.5	17.9	5.1	22.7	13.6

Table 24--Activities where AIC should use conferences, workshops, and institutes, by farm credit district

Farm credit district												
Activity	Spring- field	Balti- more	Columbia	Louis- ville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacra- mento	Spokane
Percent of total in each district												
Director education	75.9	70.3	59.5	70.3	72.7	58.9	60.0	61.3	68.3	68.2	68.2	68.6
Management training and development	69.0	67.6	56.8	63.6	68.2	61.6	67.5	58.8	65.9	68.2	72.7	68.6
Young farmers education	65.5	73.0	75.7	74.6	90.9	68.8	66.3	55.0	61.0	72.7	63.6	68.6
Work with extension and educators	55.2	73.0	56.8	60.2	72.7	53.6	58.8	56.3	46.3	50.0	54.5	57.1
Cooperative image building	48.3	45.9	54.1	54.2	59.1	41.1	52.5	33.8	53.7	50.0	22.7	45.7
Employee education	48.3	64.9	54.1	60.2	68.2	43.8	48.8	43.8	61.0	63.6	31.8	45.7
Work with professional associations	48.3	51.4	48.6	49.2	50.0	51.8	58.8	47.5	48.8	40.9	50.0	54.3
Work with universities	48.3	59.5	54.1	47.5	59.1	52.7	43.8	41.3	53.7	68.2	40.9	54.3
Youth education	48.3	73.0	45.9	55.9	77.3	45.5	56.3	37.5	53.7	59.1	45.5	42.9
Work with media	44.8	40.5	24.3	29.7	40.9	32.1	28.8	36.3	31.7	50.0	36.4	37.1
Educate and inform legislators	44.8	32.4	37.8	39.0	31.8	38.4	27.5	31.3	26.8	50.0	40.9	34.3
Affiliated professionals education	41.4	40.5	40.5	36.4	18.2	32.1	40.0	43.8	39.0	54.5	27.3	31.4
Director certification	41.4	51.4	45.9	46.6	68.2	33.0	38.8	52.5	46.3	59.1	54.5	57.1
Work with general farm organizations	41.4	40.5	51.4	45.8	50.0	51.8	43.8	48.8	46.3	45.5	27.3	22.9
Work with international co-op organizations	31.0	29.7	43.2	38.1	45.5	41.1	41.3	26.3	31.7	31.8	27.3	25.7
Member education	27.6	21.6	21.6	33.1	50.0	30.4	27.5	18.8	19.5	54.5	31.8	25.7
Educate general public	13.8	18.9	13.5	18.6	18.2	18.8	16.3	8.8	17.1	18.2	18.2	14.3

Table 25--Activities where AIC should use educational materials, by all respondents and selected groups

Activity	All cooperatives and selected groups									
	All co-ops	Marketing supply, & service co-ops	Credit co-ops	Telephone and Electric co-ops	State Co-op Councils	Regional & inter-regional co-ops	Mixed structure co-ops	Federated co-ops	Centralized co-ops	All marketing co-ops except grain
	Percent of total in each group									
Educate general public	77.5	74.8	79.7	76.3	88.5	76.6	73.1	73.5	78.0	71.0
Member education	77.0	76.9	76.6	78.0	80.8	84.7	92.3	75.5	76.4	76.3
Cooperative image building	72.9	71.4	73.0	72.9	88.5	79.3	80.8	77.6	72.1	71.8
Youth education	70.7	70.1	69.9	67.8	92.3	81.1	84.6	83.7	68.9	68.7
Work with media	70.1	68.0	71.1	76.3	69.2	78.4	76.9	77.6	69.1	66.4
Educate and inform legislators	67.7	66.7	68.4	72.9	61.5	72.1	69.2	67.3	67.7	66.4
Young farmers education	67.2	65.0	68.4	66.1	84.6	76.6	76.9	79.6	65.7	64.1
Work with professional associations	65.7	66.0	64.8	66.1	69.2	72.1	76.9	69.4	64.8	68.7
Work with universities	65.5	61.9	65.6	74.6	84.6	72.1	73.1	75.5	64.3	65.6
Work with extension and educators	57.5	55.8	55.1	69.5	73.1	66.7	73.1	67.3	55.9	55.0
Employee education	57.0	56.1	53.5	71.2	69.2	64.0	57.7	65.3	56.3	56.5
Work with general farm organizations	56.5	56.1	55.9	64.4	50.0	66.7	73.1	59.2	55.5	61.1
Director education	53.5	56.8	47.7	49.2	84.6	58.6	50.0	61.2	53.0	55.7
Affiliated professionals education	50.7	49.3	52.0	50.8	53.8	57.7	65.4	59.2	49.3	45.8
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	43.0	42.9	41.8	47.5	73.1	66.7	73.1	67.3	42.5	45.0
Management training and development	42.0	45.2	37.1	40.7	57.7	57.7	53.8	51.0	40.7	43.5
Director certification	33.7	38.1	28.9	27.1	46.2	40.5	30.8	32.7	33.9	41.2

Table 26--Activities where AIC should use educational materials, by cooperative size

Activity	Size groupings					
	Less	\$10 to	\$25 to	\$75 to	\$250 to	\$1 bil.
	than \$10 mil.	\$24.9 mil.	\$74.9 mil.	\$249.9 mil.	\$999.9 mil.	or more
Percent of total in each group						
Educate general public	78.8	73.9	81.2	73.5	75.0	77.3
Member education	73.6	80.7	77.8	76.5	75.0	86.4
Cooperative image building	71.2	68.9	76.1	75.5	72.7	68.2
Youth education	70.3	68.1	70.1	64.3	84.1	77.3
Work with media	66.5	69.7	73.5	72.4	72.7	68.2
Educate and inform legislators	66.0	63.0	76.9	67.3	68.2	72.7
Young farmers education	64.6	66.4	64.1	67.3	77.3	77.3
Work with professional associations	62.3	68.1	64.1	66.3	72.7	77.3
Work with universities	59.0	62.2	65.0	72.4	77.3	77.3
Work with general farm organizations	57.5	51.3	59.8	51.0	65.9	68.2
Director education	57.1	50.4	52.1	45.9	56.8	45.5
Employee education	57.1	57.1	51.3	56.1	70.5	50.0
Work with extension and educators	55.7	55.5	54.7	58.2	61.4	72.7
Affiliated professionals education	49.5	45.4	59.0	48.0	45.5	68.2
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	40.6	43.7	41.0	42.9	45.5	50.0
Management training and development	40.6	38.7	41.9	40.8	54.5	50.0
Director certification	35.4	31.1	34.2	30.6	36.4	31.8

media, (8) build cooperative image, and (9) work with professional associations (table 27).

Educational Consulting Services

Selected Groups. Less than 54 percent of respondents in each group thought AIC should use educational consulting services to be most effective in carrying out specific activities. The percentage of respondents indicating use of consulting services to work with universities ranged from 36.7 percent for federated cooperatives to 49.2 percent for electric cooperatives (table 28).

State councils thought AIC should use educational consulting services for educating directors and director certification with 53.8 and 46.2 percent response rates, respectively.

By Cooperative Size. The major differences in where AIC should use educational consulting services appeared to be with largest cooperatives (sales of \$1 billion or more). Fifty percent of the these cooperatives thought AIC should use educational consulting services to work with professional associations and for cooperative image building. In both cases, percent response was much higher than percent response in other size groupings (table 29).

One area where largest cooperatives thought educational consulting services would not be too effective was in educating and informing legislators and in educating young farmers. Only 13.6 percent of the largest cooperatives believed the use of educational consulting services would be effective in educating these groups.

By Farm Credit District. Respondents who thought AIC should use educational consulting services to work with general farm organizations varied from 31.4 percent of respondents in Spokane to 50 percent of respondents in Texas (table 30). For some activities, the range was more significant. For example, 9.1 and 40.9 percent of respondents in Jackson and Sacramento, respectively, believed AIC should use this method for management training and development. However, use of educational consulting services did not appear to be the most effective method of conducting many AIC activities in the Jackson district.

Inappropriate AIC Activities

Selected Groups. Director certification, management training and development, affiliated professionals education, and employee education were activities where most groups thought AIC should not participate (table 31).

More than one-fourth (26.9 percent) of the State councils and mixed structure cooperatives believed AIC should not be educating and informing legislators. More than 23 percent of the mixed structure cooperatives also identified education of the general public as an inappropriate activity for AIC. More than 18 percent of the federated cooperatives, 15.3 percent of regional and interregional cooperatives, and 11.5 percent of grain marketing cooperatives agreed.

AIC's work with international cooperative organizations also was considered inappropriate by 14.6 to 20.4 percent of the federated cooperatives, mixed structure cooperatives, regional and interregional cooperatives, State councils, and all marketing cooperatives except grain marketing cooperatives.

By Cooperative Size. Nearly one-third of the largest cooperatives thought AIC should not be involved in director certification. In smaller cooperatives, this ranged from 19.7 to 28.6 percent of respondents (table 32). A larger percentage

Table 27--Activities where AIC should use educational materials, by farm credit district

Activity	Farm credit district											
	Spring- field	Balti- more	Columbia	Louis- ville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacra- mento	Spokane
	Percent of total in each district											
Youth education	86.2	81.1	75.7	68.6	54.5	72.3	66.3	73.8	65.9	63.6	63.6	71.4
Member education	86.2	86.5	62.2	74.6	72.7	83.0	78.8	77.5	78.0	50.0	68.2	82.9
Educate general public	79.3	81.1	75.7	77.1	81.8	79.5	77.5	76.3	80.5	54.5	77.3	80.0
Young farmers education	75.9	81.1	67.6	64.4	54.5	66.1	66.3	71.3	70.7	59.1	68.2	60.0
Work with universities	72.4	70.3	75.7	61.0	59.1	68.8	71.3	62.5	61.0	50.0	63.6	62.9
Educate and inform legislators	72.4	64.9	62.2	66.9	77.3	67.9	68.8	63.8	61.0	63.6	81.8	77.1
Work with media	72.4	70.3	73.0	68.6	81.8	75.9	71.3	60.0	70.7	63.6	72.7	65.7
Employee education	72.4	70.3	48.6	52.5	50.0	56.3	58.8	61.3	65.9	40.9	45.5	54.3
Work with professional associations	65.5	78.4	73.0	64.4	81.8	67.9	58.8	63.8	65.9	63.6	54.5	60.0
Cooperative image building	65.5	78.4	73.0	75.4	68.2	79.5	72.5	72.5	70.7	54.5	68.2	65.7
Director education	58.6	64.9	56.8	53.4	40.9	50.9	52.5	52.5	58.5	45.5	50.0	57.1
Management training and development	55.2	51.4	40.5	35.6	45.5	41.1	42.5	37.5	61.0	36.4	45.5	34.3
Work with general farm organizations	51.7	54.1	62.2	53.4	68.2	60.7	57.5	56.3	53.7	45.5	50.0	60.0
Affiliated professionals education	48.3	62.2	54.1	46.6	77.3	47.3	45.0	48.8	56.1	59.1	45.5	54.3
Work with extension and educators	48.3	73.0	70.3	55.9	54.5	63.4	55.0	51.3	51.2	50.0	59.1	54.3
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	37.9	40.5	59.5	44.9	45.5	38.4	42.5	46.3	48.8	27.3	36.4	40.0
Director certification	34.5	32.4	40.5	29.7	31.8	33.9	35.0	38.8	36.6	27.3	18.2	37.1

Table 28--Activities where ALC should use educational consulting services, by all respondents and selected groups

Activity	All cooperatives and selected groups									
	All co-ops	Marketing supply, & service co-ops	Credit co-ops	Telephone and Electric co-ops	State Co-op Councils	Regional & inter-regional co-ops	Mixed structure co-ops	Federated co-ops	Centralized co-ops	All marketing co-ops except grain
	Percent of total in each group									
Work with universities	40.6	37.8	41.4	49.2	46.2	41.4	38.5	36.7	41.1	39.7
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	39.8	40.5	40.2	35.6	38.5	37.8	26.9	38.8	40.5	38.5
Work with general farm organizations	37.0	37.8	37.5	33.9	30.8	42.3	34.6	36.7	37.1	36.5
Work with extension and educators	36.1	33.7	37.5	39.0	42.3	35.1	38.5	30.6	36.4	37.5
Educate and inform legislators	33.1	35.0	34.8	20.3	23.1	30.6	23.1	24.5	34.3	27.1
Work with professional associations	32.4	28.9	35.2	33.9	42.3	38.7	38.5	32.7	32.1	31.3
Work with media	32.1	32.0	32.8	33.9	23.1	35.1	38.5	26.5	32.3	33.3
Affiliated professionals education	31.0	32.7	27.7	33.9	38.5	32.4	30.8	30.6	31.1	33.3
Management training and development	26.3	23.5	27.3	30.5	38.5	27.9	26.9	30.6	25.9	30.2
Young farmers education	22.0	20.7	21.9	23.7	34.6	19.8	23.1	20.4	22.1	27.1
Cooperative image building	21.3	21.1	19.5	25.4	30.8	29.7	26.9	30.6	20.2	21.9
Youth education	20.3	21.4	18.0	20.3	30.8	26.1	42.3	16.3	19.6	26.0
Director education	20.3	18.7	20.7	11.9	53.8	23.4	26.9	16.3	20.4	20.8
Member education	20.0	17.7	21.5	20.3	30.8	22.5	38.5	22.4	18.9	26.0
Employee education	17.6	15.6	19.5	16.9	23.1	17.1	23.1	22.4	17.0	17.7
Educate general public	17.0	19.0	14.5	15.3	23.1	21.6	26.9	12.2	17.0	21.9
Director certification	15.7	14.3	14.8	13.6	46.2	16.2	19.2	20.4	15.2	14.6

Table 29--Activities where AIC should use educational consulting services, by cooperative size

Activity	Size groupings					
	Less					
	than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.9 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
Percent of total in each group						
Work with extension and educators	46.2	34.5	36.8	32.7	40.9	31.8
Work with universities	42.0	41.2	41.9	35.7	38.6	40.9
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	38.7	45.4	41.0	40.8	31.8	31.8
Work with general farm organizations	34.4	42.0	37.6	37.8	31.8	40.9
Work with professional associations	34.0	29.4	35.0	27.6	27.3	50.0
Work with media	31.1	32.8	31.6	33.7	31.8	40.9
Educate and inform legislators	29.2	39.5	39.3	30.6	36.4	13.6
Affiliated professionals education	27.4	41.2	30.8	24.5	34.1	27.3
Management training and development	26.9	21.8	25.6	24.5	40.9	27.3
Cooperative image building	19.8	26.9	20.5	12.2	18.2	50.0
Young farmers education	19.3	22.7	29.9	15.3	22.7	13.6
Educate general public	19.3	14.3	12.8	17.3	25.0	22.7
Director education	18.4	21.0	20.5	13.3	31.8	18.2
Employee education	16.5	16.0	17.9	20.4	15.9	27.3
Member education	15.6	22.7	20.5	17.3	31.8	22.7
Youth education	15.1	18.5	27.4	16.3	27.3	27.3
Director certification	13.2	16.0	12.0	13.3	20.5	27.3

Table 30--Activities where AIC should use educational consulting services, by farm credit district

Farm credit district												
Activity	Spring- field	Balti- more	Columbia	Louis- ville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacra- mento	Spokane
	Percent of total in each district											
Work with general farm organizations	41.4	40.5	35.1	39.0	31.8	33.9	35.0	36.3	36.6	50.0	45.5	31.4
Work with extension and educators	41.4	29.7	32.4	40.7	18.2	33.0	35.0	40.0	43.9	36.4	31.8	34.3
Work with universities	37.9	45.9	32.4	50.0	27.3	39.3	36.3	45.0	39.0	36.4	36.4	34.3
Work with professional associations	37.9	43.2	29.7	31.4	13.6	32.1	30.0	33.8	29.3	18.2	50.0	40.0
Management training and development	34.5	32.4	27.0	24.6	9.1	22.3	27.5	26.3	34.1	22.7	40.9	22.9
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	27.6	40.5	35.1	46.6	40.9	33.9	37.5	42.5	51.2	31.8	40.9	40.0
Work with media	27.6	32.4	29.7	39.0	31.8	26.8	31.3	31.3	41.5	27.3	31.8*	28.6
Youth education	24.1	21.6	21.6	22.0	13.6	21.4	16.3	20.0	22.0	27.3	13.6	17.1
Cooperative image building	24.1	27.0	10.8	25.4	9.1	19.6	21.3	22.5	19.5	18.2	27.3	20.0
Director education	20.7	32.4	27.0	17.8	4.5	11.6	18.8	28.8	17.1	22.7	27.3	28.6
Member education	20.7	27.0	13.5	22.9	22.7	18.8	16.3	22.5	12.2	27.3	36.4	8.6
Educate and inform legislators	20.7	24.3	24.3	39.0	40.9	30.4	32.5	36.3	46.3	31.8	40.9	20.0
Director certification	20.7	27.0	29.7	9.3	4.5	14.3	12.5	20.0	14.6	18.2	18.2	14.3
Young farmers education	20.7	29.7	18.9	24.6	22.7	19.6	16.3	27.5	19.5	27.3	18.2	20.0
Affiliated professionals education	20.7	27.0	21.6	34.7	13.6	27.7	40.0	28.8	41.5	31.8	27.3	37.1
Educate general public	20.7	18.9	13.5	15.3	13.6	17.0	16.3	20.0	17.1	36.4	9.1	11.4
Employee education	17.2	29.7	21.6	15.3	0.0	14.3	17.5	20.0	17.1	18.2	27.3	20.0

Table 31--Activities reported inappropriate for AIC, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups														
Activity	Marketing supply, & service co-ops		Telephone and Electric co-ops		State Co-op Councils		Regional & inter-regionals		Mixed structure co-ops		Centralized co-ops		All marketing co-ops except grain	
	All co-ops	co-ops	Credit co-ops	Electric co-ops	Co-op	Co-ops	Co-ops	regionals	co-ops	Federated co-ops	co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	co-ops	grain
Percent of Total in each group														
Director certification	22.8	20.4	25.4	27.1	15.4	21.6	30.8	30.6	21.8	22.9	19.8			
Management training and development	14.2	13.6	16.0	10.2	11.5	13.5	15.4	16.3	13.9	12.2	10.4			
Affiliated professionals education	12.8	10.2	15.6	13.6	11.5	11.7	11.5	16.3	12.5	10.7	9.4			
Employee education	11.8	13.9	10.9	6.8	7.7	13.5	15.4	12.2	11.6	15.3	10.4			
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	8.2	9.2	6.6	6.8	15.4	16.2	19.2	20.4	6.6	6.9	14.6			
Educate general public	8.2	7.8	9.8	6.8	0.0	15.3	23.1	18.4	6.6	11.5	9.4			
Director education	6.0	6.1	7.0	3.4	0.0	7.2	11.5	8.2	5.5	8.4	5.2			
Member education	5.8	5.1	7.4	3.4	3.8	5.4	7.7	6.1	5.7	6.9	3.1			
Educate and inform legislators	4.4	4.4	2.3	3.4	26.9	11.7	26.9	14.3	2.5	3.8	5.2			
Work with general farm organizations	4.3	4.8	3.1	1.7	15.4	5.4	7.7	8.2	3.8	3.8	10.4			
Youth education	3.9	2.4	6.3	3.4	0.0	2.7	0.0	4.1	4.1	3.1	1.0			
Work with media	3.0	4.4	1.6	1.7	3.8	5.4	7.7	6.1	2.5	5.3	2.1			
Young farmers education	1.7	1.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.8	0.0	1.8	1.5	1.0			
Work with professional associations	1.7	2.0	1.2	1.7	3.8	1.8	3.8	0.0	1.8	3.1	3.1			
Cooperative image building	1.6	2.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.8	3.1			
Work with extension and educators	1.4	2.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.8	4.1	1.1	2.3	1.0			
Work with universities	1.1	1.7	0.4	1.7	0.0	1.8	3.8	2.0	0.9	1.5	1.0			

Table 32--Activities reported inappropriate for AIC, by cooperative size

Activity	Size grouping					
	Less					
	than	\$10 to	\$25 to	\$75 to	\$250 to	\$1 bil.
	\$10	\$24.9	\$74.9	\$249.9	\$999.9	or
	mil.	mil.	mil.	mil.	mil.	more
Percent of total in each group						
Director certification	19.3	28.6	19.7	25.5	25.0	36.4
Management training and development	12.3	15.1	11.1	19.4	15.9	9.1
Affiliated professionals education	10.4	11.8	12.8	18.4	18.2	9.1
Employee education	9.9	10.9	9.4	19.4	11.4	18.2
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	6.1	5.1	5.1	8.2	29.5	13.6
Member education	5.2	5.0	6.0	9.2	4.5	4.5
Educate general public	4.7	9.2	5.1	15.3	13.6	13.6
Educate and inform legislators	3.8	1.7	0.9	3.1	11.4	18.2
Youth education	3.8	4.2	2.6	7.1	2.3	4.5
Director education	3.8	7.6	4.3	9.2	6.8	18.2
Work with media	3.3	3.4	0.9	2.0	4.5	4.5
Work with general farm organizations	2.8	3.4	0.0	8.2	11.4	0.0
Cooperative image building	1.9	0.8	0.0	4.1	2.3	0.0
Work with universities	1.9	0.8	0.0	1.0	2.3	0.0
Work with professional associations	1.4	1.7	0.0	2.0	4.5	4.5
Young farmers education	1.4	2.5	0.9	2.0	4.5	0.0
Work with extension and educators	0.9	0.8	1.7	3.1	2.3	0.0

of the larger cooperatives (sales of \$75 million and above) believed employee education, work with international cooperative organizations, educating general public, educating and informing legislators, and director education were inappropriate AIC activities.

By Farm Credit District. From 10 to more than 30 percent of respondents in each farm credit district believed director certification is not an appropriate AIC activity. Other activities identified by 3 to 18 percent of respondents in each district as inappropriate for AIC included (1) management training and development, (2) affiliated professionals education, (3) employee education, (4) work with international organizations, and (5) educating the general public (table 33).

General Impressions About AIC

Selected Groups

Nearly 47 percent of all respondents believed AIC's programs and activities needed some changes and new emphasis. Nearly 44 percent thought they did a satisfactory job. Only 5 percent thought they needed a major restructuring. However, 11.5 percent of the State councils and mixed structure cooperatives believed AIC's programs and activities needed major restructuring (table 34). Nearly 62 percent of the mixed structure cooperatives thought AIC's programs and activities needed some changes and new emphasis.

Nearly one-third of all respondents believed AIC's programs and activities should be directed to all types of cooperatives. Nearly 80 percent of the electric cooperatives and nearly 39 percent of the State councils agreed.

Nearly 45 percent of all respondents believed AIC's programs and activities should focus on general cooperative practices, principles, and issues. This ranged from 37.8 percent of respondents for regional and interregional cooperatives to 51 percent of respondents for federated cooperatives. Responses were fairly consistent across all groups.

By Cooperative Size

The largest cooperatives thought AIC's programs and activities needed some changes and new emphasis. Nearly 73 percent believed this and more than 9 percent thought they needed a major restructuring (table 35). The largest cooperatives also believed AIC's programs and activities should be directed more toward agricultural cooperatives.

By Farm Credit District

More than 62 percent of respondents in Springfield and Texas districts believed AIC's programs and activities did a satisfactory job. However, the percentage of respondents that believed they needed some changes and new emphasis ranged from 27.3 percent in Texas to 59.1 percent in Jackson. More than 18 percent of respondents in Sacramento believed AIC's programs and activities needed major restructuring (table 36).

From 41 to 49 percent of respondents in St. Paul, Texas, Omaha, and Spokane believed AIC's programs and activities should be directed to all types of cooperatives. Nearly 42 to 46 percent of respondents in Wichita, Baltimore, and Jackson districts thought they should be directed primarily to agricultural cooperatives with some consumer cooperative involvement.

Table 33--Activities inappropriate for AIC, by farm credit district

Farm credit district												
Activity	Spring- field	Balti- more	Columbia	Louis- ville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Omaha	Wichita	Texas	Sacra- mento	Spokane
Percent of total in each district												
Work with internat'l co-op organizations	20.7	10.8	5.4	5.1	4.5	8.9	10.0	3.8	9.8	13.6	13.6	5.7
Educate general public	17.2	2.7	8.1	7.6	13.6	8.0	8.8	6.3	9.8	9.1	9.1	5.7
Director certification	13.8	10.8	21.6	25.4	22.7	30.4	25.0	20.0	24.4	18.2	22.7	14.3
Educate and inform legislators	6.9	13.5	5.4	0.0	9.1	4.5	2.5	5.0	7.3	0.0	4.5	5.7
Management training and development	6.9	18.9	13.5	16.1	13.6	16.1	12.5	17.5	9.8	9.1	9.1	11.4
Affiliated professionals education	6.9	16.2	13.5	11.0	18.2	17.0	12.5	8.8	12.2	9.1	18.2	11.4
Work with media	3.4	5.4	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.8	3.8	5.0	9.8	0.0	4.5	0.0
Work with general farm organizations	3.4	13.5	2.7	2.5	0.0	1.8	5.0	3.8	9.8	0.0	9.1	5.7
Work with extension and educators	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	1.8	1.3	0.0	4.9	0.0	9.1	0.0
Cooperative image building	3.4	5.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.9	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	9.1	2.9
Employee education	3.4	5.4	10.8	15.3	9.1	12.5	13.8	10.0	12.2	9.1	18.2	11.4
Youth education	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	9.1	3.6	3.8	3.8	7.3	9.1	18.2	5.7
Member education	0.0	5.4	13.5	5.1	4.5	2.7	7.5	8.8	12.2	4.5	4.5	0.0
Work with professional associations	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.8	4.5	1.8	2.5	1.3	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Young farmers education	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	1.8	0.0	3.8	4.9	4.5	9.1	0.0
Director education	0.0	2.7	8.1	5.1	18.2	8.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.5	9.1	5.7
Work with universities	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3	2.4	4.5	9.1	2.9

Table 34--General impressions about AIC, by all respondents and selected groups

All cooperatives and selected groups								
Activity	Marketing supply, & service co-ops		Telephone and Electric co-ops		Regional State & inter-regional co-ops		All market- ing co-ops	
	Credit co-ops	Co-op structure	Federated co-ops	Mixed co-ops	Centralized co-ops	Grain marketing co-ops	except grain	
Percent of total in each group								
AIC's programs and activities:								
-do a satisfactory job	43.6	42.9	44.1	50.8	36.9	19.2	32.7	45.7
-need some changes and new emphasis	46.6	47.6	47.7	33.9	55.0	61.5	55.1	45.2
-need a major restructuring	5.0	3.4	6.3	5.1	11.5	4.5	10.2	4.3
AIC's programs and activities should be directed:								
-to agricultural co-ops and their constituencies	27.9	29.3	32.0	3.4	26.9	36.0	36.7	26.8
-primarily to agricultural co-ops with some consumer co-op involvement	32.9	36.7	33.6	10.2	34.6	33.3	28.6	33.0
-to all types of cooperatives	35.6	29.3	32.4	79.7	38.5	27.9	32.7	36.6
AIC's programs and activities should:								
-focus on general cooperative practices, principles, and issues	44.7	44.2	45.3	45.8	42.3	37.8	51.0	44.5
-be responsive to individual educational needs of member co-ops	18.0	20.1	17.2	13.6	11.5	18.9	14.3	18.2
-provide individual educational services as well as general programs	32.6	29.3	35.2	33.9	42.3	38.7	32.7	32.5

Table 35--General impressions about American Institute of Cooperation, by cooperative size

Activity	Size groupings					
	Less					
	than \$10 mil.	\$10 to \$24.9 mil.	\$25 to \$74.9 mil.	\$75 to \$249.9 mil.	\$250 to \$999.9 mil.	\$1 bil. or more
Percent of total in each group						
AIC's programs and activities:						
-do a satisfactory job	45.8	44.5	48.7	42.9	38.6	18.2
-need some changes and new emphasis	43.9	50.4	42.7	46.9	43.2	72.7
-need a major restructuring	4.7	2.5	3.4	6.1	11.4	9.1
AIC's programs and activities should be directed:						
-to agricultural co-ops and their constituencies	23.1	25.2	29.9	35.7	31.8	36.4
-primarily to agricultural co-ops with some consumer co-op involvement	34.0	34.5	33.3	26.5	34.1	40.9
-to all types of cooperatives	37.7	38.7	32.5	34.7	29.5	22.7
AIC's programs and activities should						
-focus on general cooperative practices, principles, and issues	46.2	47.1	37.6	50.0	40.9	50.0
-be responsive to individual educational needs of member co-ops	17.5	16.8	23.1	17.3	13.6	18.2
-provide individual educational services as well as general programs	29.7	33.6	34.2	29.6	38.6	27.3

Table 36--General impressions about AIC, by farm credit district

Activity	Farm credit district							
	Spring- field	Balti- more	Columbia	Louis- ville	Jackson	St. Louis	St. Paul	Sacra- mento
						Omaha	Wichita	Texas
								Spokane
Percent of total in each district								
AIC's programs and activities:								
-do a satisfactory job	62.1	48.6	43.2	44.9	31.8	42.0	38.8	31.8
-need some changes and new emphasis	37.9	48.6	40.5	46.6	59.1	47.3	53.8	45.5
-need a major restructuring	0.0	0.0	10.8	2.5	4.5	6.3	10.0	18.2
AIC's programs and activities should be directed:								
-to agricultural co-ops and their constituencies	48.3	27.0	24.3	33.1	31.8	28.6	18.8	24.4
-primarily to agricultural co-ops								
with some consumer co-op involvement	24.1	43.2	35.1	30.5	45.5	34.8	37.5	41.5
-to all types of cooperatives	27.6	27.0	35.1	32.2	22.7	32.1	41.3	31.7
AIC's programs and activities should:								
-focus on general cooperative practices, principles, and issues	37.9	37.8	35.1	42.4	50.0	44.6	46.3	54.5
-be responsive to individual educational needs of member co-ops	20.7	18.9	13.5	23.7	22.7	21.4	12.5	17.1
-provide individual educational services as well as general programs	41.4	40.5	45.9	27.1	27.3	29.5	38.8	36.4
								27.3
								40.0

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to provide U.S. cooperatives and cooperative educators with a clearer understanding of the perceptions of agricultural cooperatives concerning cooperative educational needs.

Data for the study were obtained through a mail survey of all AIC members and a stratified random sample of AIC nonmember cooperatives. Cooperatives included in the survey were (1) marketing, farm supply, and related service, (2) rural telephone, (3) rural electric, (4) statewide rural electric, (5) State cooperative councils, (6) Federal Land Banks, and (7) Production Credit Associations. Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS) assisted in developing the sampling plan and in summarizing, analyzing, and preparing this report.

Questionnaires were sent to 1,772 cooperatives. Nearly 36 percent or 635 cooperatives responded. Of those surveyed, 55 percent of AIC members and 17 percent of AIC nonmembers responded. Nearly 76 percent of respondents were AIC members and more than 24 percent AIC nonmembers. More than 84 percent of respondents were marketing, farm supply, related service, and farm credit cooperatives.

Cooperative respondents identified target audiences for cooperative education, indicated what group or groups should be providing educational services to these audiences, identified the importance AIC should place on specific activities, indicated the method or methods AIC should use to conduct specific activities to be most effective, and gave their impressions of AIC.

Data were presented for all respondents and 10 selected groups (1) marketing, farm supply, and related service (MSRS), (2) credit, (3) rural telephone and electric (electric), (4) State councils, (5) regionals and interregionals, (6) mixed structure, (7) federated, (8) centralized, (9) grain marketing, and (10) marketing excluding grain marketing cooperatives (MEGM). Responses were also summarized by cooperative size and by farm credit district.

Target Audiences

MSRS cooperatives ranked young farmers, directors, members, managers, employees, and legislators as highest priority target audiences for cooperative education. Credit cooperatives identified legislators, young farmers, and prospective members as highest priority. Employees, members, and legislators were highest priority for electric cooperatives. State cooperative councils gave directors, managers, young farmers, and high school students highest priority for cooperative education. Cooperatives with different organizational structures gave somewhat different priorities to target audiences.

Of the 17 target audiences listed, all but two--grade school educators and grade school students--fell within high and medium priority for cooperative education by all respondents.

By size, smaller cooperatives identified young farmers as highest priority target audience for cooperative education. Somewhat larger cooperatives thought members were most important. Largest cooperatives ranked legislators highest priority.

By farm credit district, young farmers were the highest priority in 8 of 12 districts. Respondents in the Baltimore district ranked directors number one. Managers were highest priority in Texas and Spokane districts. Prospective members were highest priority in Sacramento.

Who Should Provide Education

Respondents indicated if cooperatives, State cooperative organizations, AIC, ACS, and/or Extension Service should be major providers, minor providers, or have little or no involvement in educating given target audiences.

Regional and Local Cooperatives

Respondents identified cooperatives as major or minor providers of education to all target audiences. All 10 selected groups identified cooperatives as major providers of education to members, directors, young farmers, employees, prospective members, managers, media, and legislators. All groups identified members as highest or relatively high-priority for education by cooperatives. Electric cooperatives and State councils gave highest priority to employees.

In each farm credit district, respondents believed cooperatives should be major providers of education to members, directors, employees, young farmers, prospective members, managers, and media. However, ranking of target audiences by respondents in each district was somewhat different.

State Cooperative Organizations

State cooperative organizations should be at least minor providers of education to all target audiences. All but three selected groups identified legislators as the highest priority target audience for State cooperative organizations. Electric cooperatives ranked managers, media, and directors higher than legislators. State cooperative councils and mixed structure cooperatives ranked young farmers above legislators.

Respondents in each size category identified legislators as the number one target audience for cooperative education by State cooperative organizations. The largest cooperatives gave more weight to State organizations educating county extension agents, postsecondary educators, and grade school educators and students than did smaller cooperatives.

Respondents in 8 of 12 farm credit districts indicated legislators as the highest priority target audience. Two districts identified young farmers; the remaining two ranked managers highest priority. Respondents in every district believed State cooperative organizations should be major providers of education to legislators, young farmers, media, directors, and managers.

American Institute of Cooperation

AIC, according to all respondents, should be a major provider of education to media, legislators, university extension and research personnel, managers, young farmers, and the general public. Credit cooperatives gave lower weights to AIC educating young farmers and the general public than did MSRS cooperatives. Electric cooperatives believed AIC should give more emphasis to educating county extension agents and high school educators and less emphasis on educating legislators than did MSRS and credit cooperatives. State cooperative councils gave university extension and research personnel highest priority and legislators lowest priority for cooperative education by AIC. Mixed structure cooperatives identified general public number one target audience for AIC.

Cooperatives with sales less than \$250 million identified media, university extension and research personnel, and legislators as the three most important target audiences for AIC. Cooperatives in the \$250 to \$999.9 million sales range

identified legislators, university extension and research personnel, and young farmers as the top three target audiences. University extension and research personnel, media, and postsecondary educators are the top three target audiences identified by the largest cooperatives (sales of \$1 billion and over).

Responses by farm credit district on the extent AIC should be providing education to target audiences varied considerably. For example, respondents in Springfield and Jackson districts ranked young farmers as number one target audience. Media was highest priority in St. Louis, Omaha, and Sacramento districts. Louisville and Spokane districts indicated highest priority for university extension and research personnel. Legislators were highest priority in Columbia, St. Paul, and Texas districts.

Agricultural Cooperative Service

All respondents identified ACS as a major provider of education to university extension and research personnel, media, and legislators and a minor provider of education to remaining target audiences except for grade school educators and students.

MSRS cooperatives also included county extension agents in the above target audiences. Credit cooperatives ranked legislators as first priority for ACS but gave less weight to many of the target audiences than did MSRS cooperatives. Electric cooperatives identified county extension agents number one priority for ACS. They also believed ACS should be a major provider of education to managers and young farmers. State cooperative councils put higher weights on ACS educating university extension and research personnel, managers, and postsecondary students. Much lower priority was given to ACS educating legislators.

Small cooperatives believed ACS should be the major provider of education to university extension and research personnel, media, and legislators. The largest cooperatives identified only two audiences--county extension agents and university extension and research personnel. The larger cooperatives also gave much lower priority to ACS educating managers than did smaller cooperatives.

Respondents in six districts believed university extension and research personnel should be highest priority target audience for ACS. Springfield, Jackson, and St. Louis identified legislators as highest priority. Baltimore and Wichita respondents identified media as most important. Only one district, Texas, identified young farmers as highest priority target audience for ACS.

Extension Service

The Extension Service should be a major provider of education to county extension agents, university extension and research personnel, and young farmers. It should be a minor provider of education to remaining target audiences except for employees where it should have little or no involvement.

MSRS and credit cooperatives ranking of target audiences for cooperative education by Extension Service was similar to the ranking of target audiences by all respondents. Electric cooperatives believed Extension should be a major provider of education to larger numbers of target audiences. State cooperative councils gave lower priority to Extension educating high school and grade school students and legislators than did other groups. Mixed structure and marketing cooperatives also identified Extension as a major provider of education to the general public.

Cooperatives in the \$10 to \$24.9 million sales range also believed Extension should be a major provider of education to the general public and legislators. The general public was also included by cooperatives in the next larger sales category. The largest cooperatives included the general public and high school educators.

Respondents in almost all districts believed Extension Service should be a major provider of education to county extension agents, young farmers, and university extension and research personnel. Respondents in only three districts--Jackson, St. Paul, and Spokane--considered the Extension Service as a major provider of cooperative education to the general public.

Important AIC Activities

All respondents believed promoting cooperatives was the most important activity for AIC. By selected groups, only two, State cooperative councils and mixed structure cooperatives, did not consider promoting cooperatives as the most important AIC activity. State cooperative councils and mixed structure cooperatives identified educational materials development and coordination with State organizations as AIC's most important activity, respectively.

Respondents in every size group except one (sales of \$250 to \$999.9 million) identified promoting cooperatives as the highest AIC priority. The one group identified central clearinghouse for education and training materials as most important activity for AIC.

Promoting cooperatives was most important activity for AIC in eight farm credit districts. In Baltimore and Spokane districts, respondents identified the most important activity as coordination with State organizations. Youth education was most important in Jackson and coordination with other national cooperative associations was most important in Omaha.

Methods AIC Should Use in Educational Efforts

More than two-thirds of all respondents believed AIC should use conferences, workshops, and institutes (CWI) to educate young farmers. Nearly 77 percent of State cooperative councils believed AIC should use CWI to educate young farmers and youth. A majority of respondents in each group except mixed structure cooperatives, identified CWI to be most effective in educating young farmers, director education, management training and development, and work with extension and educators.

Seventy-one percent or more of respondents in each group believed AIC should use educational materials to educate the general public and members, and for cooperative image building. More than 75 percent of the credit cooperatives indicated AIC should use educational materials to educate the general public and members.

Less than 54 percent of respondents in each group believed AIC should use educational consulting services to be most effective in carrying out given activities. State cooperative councils and the largest cooperatives favored greater use of educational consulting services for educating selected target audiences than did other groups and sizes of cooperatives.

Director certification, management training and development, affiliated professionals education, and employee education were activities where most groups believed AIC should not be involved.

General Impressions About AIC

While a majority of respondents believed AIC's programs and activities needed some changes, nearly 44 percent believed they did a satisfactory job. Eighty-two percent of the largest cooperatives believed some changes are needed. Nearly one-third of all respondents (80 percent of electric cooperatives) believed they should be directed to all types of cooperatives. Nearly 45 percent of all respondents believed they should focus on general cooperative practices, principles, and issues.

Methodology

A mail questionnaire was prepared by AIC, evaluated by AIC's National Consulting Committee on Educational Aids, formatted for statistical analysis by ACS and Statistical Reporting Service (SRS), and tested by having the AIC board of directors complete it. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix.

The questionnaire was sent to all AIC members; 110 largest marketing, supply, and related service cooperatives not AIC members; and a stratified random sample of all remaining AIC nonmembers--MSRS, rural telephone, rural electric, statewide rural electric, Federal Land Banks, and Production Credit. The survey involved 8,146 cooperatives.

Questionnaires were mailed to 1,772 cooperatives (866 AIC members and 906 nonmembers) in March 1985. Nonrespondents were sent a second questionnaire in late April. Data summary was begun in June. 4/

Usable questionnaires were obtained from 635 cooperatives--a 36-percent response. More than a majority, 55 percent, of AIC members responded to the survey. Of the members, nearly 93 percent of the marketing cooperatives and more than 81 percent of the State cooperative councils returned the questionnaire. However, only 17 percent of AIC nonmembers surveyed responded. Among the nonmembers, the poorest response came from rural telephone cooperatives, with only 2 of 54 responding. The type and number of cooperatives surveyed and response rate are shown in appendix table 1.

4/ A preliminary report entitled "Cooperative Education Needs" was presented by Charles A. Kraenzle at the National Institute of Cooperative Education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, July 29 and 31, 1985.

Appendix Table 1--Cooperatives included in AIC's cooperative educational needs survey

Type of cooperative	Population	Surveyed	Respondents	
			-----Number-----	Percent <u>1/</u>
AIC members:				
Marketing	147	147	136	92.5
Farm supply & related service	185	185	37	20.0
Credit	421	421	240	57.0
State Councils	32	32	26	81.3
Rural telephone & electric	81	81	41	50.6
Subtotal	<u>866</u>	<u>866</u>	<u>480</u>	55.4
AIC nonmembers:				
Largest marketing, supply, & related service	110	110	28	25.5
Remaining marketing, supply, & related service	5,200	578	93	16.1
Rural telephone	487	54	2	3.7
Rural electric	945	105	15	14.3
Statewide rural electric	33	3	1	33.3
Federal Land Bank Associations	278	31	9	29.0
Production Credit Associations	227	25	7	28.0
Subtotal	<u>7,280</u>	<u>906</u>	<u>155</u>	17.1
Total	<u>8,146</u>	<u>1,772</u>	<u>635</u>	35.8

1/ Number responding divided by the number surveyed.



American Institute of Cooperation (AIC) Cooperative Educational Needs Survey

March 26, 1985

Dear Cooperator:

The American Institute of Cooperation is celebrating its 60th anniversary during 1985. The growth and development of cooperatives in those 60 years have been phenomenal. Only the most visionary of minds could have dreamed how successful cooperatives would become.

Education has played a vital role in cooperative development, and AIC has been the leader in providing that educational emphasis for 60 years.

It is not enough, however, to rest on past accomplishments. Cooperative educational needs are as great as ever. Some of the needs are the same as 1925, some are different, some we haven't even thought about. But we must be prepared at all times to address the needs.

You can help AIC be prepared to meet your current and future educational needs by taking the time to respond to the enclosed Cooperative Educational Needs Survey. You are encouraged to share the contents of the questionnaire with other staff and/or your board to obtain their reactions before completing and returning it to AIC.

This is a very important step for AIC in planning future activities. Only you know how AIC can service you best.

Please return the completed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope before April 15, 1985. If you have questions or comments please contact AIC staff members, Walter Jacoby or David Simpson at (202) 296-6825.

Thank you for promptly completing and returning the Cooperative Educational Needs Survey.

Cooperatively yours,

Owen K. Hallberg
Owen K. Hallberg
President

O. Glenn Webb
O. Glenn Webb
Chairman

For Office Use Only

Number

(099) _____

State

(100) _____

OPEN TO BEGIN SURVEY

American Institute of Cooperation (AIC) Cooperative Educational Needs Survey

The groups listed below have been identified as target audiences for cooperative education. *Please rank each audience high, medium, or low according to the priorities of your organization.*

(Let 1 = **high priority**, 2 = **medium priority**, and 3 = **low priority**)

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|
| 1. County Extension Agents | (101) _____ | 9. Legislators | (109) _____ |
| 2. Directors | (102) _____ | 10. Managers | (110) _____ |
| 3. Employees | (103) _____ | 11. Media | (111) _____ |
| 4. General Public | (104) _____ | 12. Members | (112) _____ |
| 5. Grade School Educators | (105) _____ | 13. Post-Secondary Educators | (113) _____ |
| 6. Grade School Students | (106) _____ | 14. Post-Secondary Students | (114) _____ |
| 7. High School Educators | (107) _____ | 15. Prospective Members | (115) _____ |
| 8. High School Students | (108) _____ | 16. Univ. Extension and Research Personnel | (116) _____ |
| | | 17. Young Farmers | (117) _____ |

Please indicate to what extent cooperatives (regional or local), State cooperative associations, AIC, USDA's Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS), and Extension Service should be providing educational services to the target audiences listed below.

(Place **"1"** for a **major provider**, **"2"** for a **minor provider**, and **"3"** for **little or no involvement**. **Be sure to place a rating in each space.** The same rating may be used for more than one provider for each audience.)

Target Audiences	Co-op, Reg. or Local	State Co-op. Org.	AIC	ACS	Extension
18. County Extension Agents	(118) _____	(119) _____	(120) _____	(121) _____	(122) _____
19. Directors	(123) _____	(124) _____	(125) _____	(126) _____	(127) _____
20. Employees	(128) _____	(129) _____	(130) _____	(131) _____	(132) _____
21. General Public	(133) _____	(134) _____	(135) _____	(136) _____	(137) _____
22. Grade School Educators	(138) _____	(139) _____	(140) _____	(141) _____	(142) _____
23. Grade School Students	(143) _____	(144) _____	(145) _____	(146) _____	(147) _____
24. High School Educators	(148) _____	(149) _____	(150) _____	(151) _____	(152) _____
25. High School Students	(153) _____	(154) _____	(155) _____	(156) _____	(157) _____
26. Legislators	(158) _____	(159) _____	(160) _____	(161) _____	(162) _____
27. Managers	(163) _____	(164) _____	(165) _____	(166) _____	(167) _____
28. Media	(168) _____	(169) _____	(170) _____	(171) _____	(172) _____
29. Members	(173) _____	(174) _____	(175) _____	(176) _____	(177) _____
30. Post-Secondary Educators	(178) _____	(179) _____	(180) _____	(181) _____	(182) _____
31. Post-Secondary Students	(183) _____	(184) _____	(185) _____	(186) _____	(187) _____
32. Prospective Members	(188) _____	(189) _____	(190) _____	(191) _____	(192) _____
33. University Extension and Research Personnel	(193) _____	(194) _____	(195) _____	(196) _____	(197) _____
34. Young Farmers	(198) _____	(199) _____	(200) _____	(201) _____	(202) _____

PROCEED TO PAGE TWO

Please indicate the importance AIC should place on each of the activities listed below.

(Use a "1" for **very important**, a "2" for **somewhat important**, and a "3" for **unimportant**.)

Activities		Activities	
35. Central Clearinghouse for Education & Training Materials	(203) _____	45. Gen. Communications (Newsletters, etc.)	(213) _____
36. Coordinate with Other National Co-op Associations	(204) _____	46. Management Training & Development	(214) _____
37. Coordinate with State Organizations	(205) _____	47. Member Education	(215) _____
38. Director Certification	(206) _____	48. Promoting Co-ops	(216) _____
39. Director Education	(207) _____	49. Work with General Farm Org. (Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, Grange)	(217) _____
40. Educational Materials Development	(208) _____	50. Work with International Co-op. Org. (ACDI)	(218) _____
41. Educational Materials Distribution	(209) _____	51. Work with Professional Associations (Farm Broadcasters, Vo-Ag Teachers)	(219) _____
42. Education for Support Professionals (i.e. Lawyers, Accountants, etc.)	(210) _____	52. Yearbook (<i>American Cooperation</i>)	(220) _____
43. Employee Education	(211) _____	53. Youth Education	(221) _____
44. Encourage Co-op Research	(212) _____	54. Young Farmer Education	(222) _____

Please indicate by placing a "1" in the appropriate space the method or methods AIC should use to be most effective or indicate if not an appropriate AIC activity. (*Mark more than one method if applicable.*)

Activity	Conferences, Workshops, & Institutes	Educational Materials	Educational Consulting Services	Not Appropriate AIC Activity
55. Affiliated Professionals Education (i.e. Lawyers, Accountants, etc.)	(223) _____	(224) _____	(225) _____	(226) _____
56. Cooperative Image Building	(227) _____	(228) _____	(229) _____	(230) _____
57. Director Certification	(231) _____	(232) _____	(233) _____	(234) _____
58. Director Education	(235) _____	(236) _____	(237) _____	(238) _____
59. Educate and Inform Legislators	(239) _____	(240) _____	(241) _____	(242) _____
60. Educate General Public	(243) _____	(244) _____	(245) _____	(246) _____
61. Employee Education	(247) _____	(248) _____	(249) _____	(250) _____
62. Management Training & Development	(251) _____	(252) _____	(253) _____	(254) _____
63. Member Education	(255) _____	(256) _____	(257) _____	(258) _____
64. Work with Extension and Educators	(259) _____	(260) _____	(261) _____	(262) _____
65. Work with General Farm Organizations	(263) _____	(264) _____	(265) _____	(266) _____
66. Work with Internat'l Co-op Organizations	(267) _____	(268) _____	(269) _____	(270) _____
67. Work with Media	(271) _____	(272) _____	(273) _____	(274) _____
68. Work with Professional Associations (Farm Broadcasters, Vo-Ag Teachers)	(275) _____	(276) _____	(277) _____	(278) _____
69. Work with Universities	(279) _____	(280) _____	(281) _____	(282) _____
70. Young Farmers Education	(283) _____	(284) _____	(285) _____	(286) _____
71. Youth Education	(287) _____	(288) _____	(289) _____	(290) _____

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS ABOUT AIC—The following questions are designed to provide an opportunity for you to indicate how your organization feels about AIC and its future direction.

(Please circle the most appropriate response number.)

Response number		Response number	
72. AIC's programs and activities:		74. AIC's programs and activities should:	
-do a satisfactory job	(291) (1)	-focus on general cooperative practices, principles, and issues	(293) (1)
-need some changes and new emphasis	(2)	-be responsive to individual educational needs of member co-ops	(2)
-need a major restructuring	(3)	-provide individual educational services as well as general programs	(3)
73. AIC's programs and activities should be directed:			
-to agricultural cooperatives and their constituencies	(292) (1)		
-primarily to agricultural cooperatives with some consumer cooperative involvement	(2)		
-to all types of cooperatives	(3)		

TURN TO BACK PANEL

ORGANIZATIONAL AND BUSINESS CHARACTERISTICS—(Please circle the response number that most accurately describes your organization, #75-79)

Characteristics	Response number	Characteristics	Response number
75. Local	(294) (1)	79. Annual business volume for FY 1984:	
Regional	(2)	Less than \$10 million	(298) (1)
Interregional	(3)	\$10 to \$24.9 million	(2)
Statewide	(4)	\$25 to \$74.9 million	(3)
76. Marketing/Bargaining	(295) (1)	\$75 to \$124.9 million	(4)
Supply	(2)	\$125 to \$249.9 million	(5)
Marketing/Supply	(3)	\$250 to \$499.9 million	(6)
Service (i.e., Ginning, Drying, Trucking)	(4)	\$500 to \$749.9 million	(7)
Credit	(5)	\$750 to \$999.9 million	(8)
State Council	(6)	Over \$1 billion	(9)
Rural Telephone or Electric	(7)	80. Current mailing address (if you use P.O. Box, also include a street address):	
77. If Marketing, major commodity handled:		Organization's Name	
Cotton and Cotton Products	(296) (1)	P.O. Box	
Grain and/or Soybeans	(2)	Street Address	
Fruits and Vegetables	(3)	City, State, Zip	
Livestock	(4)	81. Chief Executive Officer:	
Milk and Dairy Products	(5)	Name	
Poultry	(6)	Title	
Other	(7)	82. Primary AIC Contact (if different from CEO):	
78. Centralized	(297) (1)	Name	
Federated	(2)	Title	
Mixed	(3)		

Many of AIC's services are targeted to specific cooperative audiences. You can help us do a better job of communicating to the right people by providing the **name, title, address,** and **phone** number of the people in your organization who are responsible for the following areas. (If one person is responsible for two or more areas, please indicate by referring to a prior number (i.e. same as #2).

83. Personnel:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

84. Training:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

85. Communications:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

86. Member Relations:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

87. Public Relations:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

88. Government Affairs:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

89. Education:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

90. Finance and Accounting:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

91. Legal:

Name and Title

Address

Phone

THANK YOU!

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Cooperative Service

Agricultural Cooperative Service (ACS) provides research, management, and educational assistance to cooperatives to strengthen the economic position of farmers and other rural residents. It works directly with cooperative leaders and Federal and State agencies to improve organization, leadership, and operation of cooperatives and to give guidance to further development.

The agency (1) helps farmers and other rural residents develop cooperatives to obtain supplies and services at lower cost and to get better prices for products they sell; (2) advises rural residents on developing existing resources through cooperative action to enhance rural living; (3) helps cooperatives improve services and operating efficiency; (4) informs members, directors, employees, and the public on how cooperatives work and benefit their members and their communities; and (5) encourages international cooperative programs.

ACS publishes research and educational materials and issues Farmer Cooperatives magazine. All programs and activities are conducted on a nondiscriminatory basis, without regard to age, race, creed, color, sex, handicap, or national origin.